THEOLOGY

A MONTHLY JOURNAL OF HISTORIC CHRISTIANITY

EDITED BY S. C. CARPENTER, D.D.

Vol. XXXVI. JANUARY, 1938 No. 211

Property of
CBDP
Please return to
Graduate Theologi
Union Library

CONTENTS

EDITORIAL

ARTICLES

Devotion at Communion in Christian Antiquity and in the Middle Ages — H. de Candole.
Rome and Reunion — A. G. Hebert, S.S.M.
The Excepting Clause in St. Matthew.
The Significance of St, Mark — G. H. Stevenson.
The Epiphany and Certain Radiant Poets — Rowland Grey.

MISCELLANEA

"The Matthean Exception" — M. R. Newbolt.
Lauda Sion — S. P. T. Prideaux, D.D.
Œcumenica — H. A. Moreton.
Notes on Periodicals — H. de C.

REVIEW

The Destiny of Man (Nicolas Berdyaev) — Thomas M. Parker.

NOTICES AND BOOK NOTES

LONDON — Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.

S.P.C.K. HOUSE, NORTHUMBERLAND AVENUE, W.C.

1s. net per copy; 12s. net per annum, post free.

v.36-37
1938

THE THEORY OF
RELIGIOUS LIBERTY
IN ENGLAND, 1603-39

By T. LYON. 7s. 6d. net

Mr Lyon's book analyses the views on toleration of the different religious parties in England between the years 1603-39, to show how, through the interplay of these shades of opinion and their modifications of each other, the idea of religious liberty, later to be of such importance in English religious and political history, first took shape.

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

HYMNODY PAST AND PRESENT

By C. S. PHILLIPS, D.D.

Chaplain of the College of St. Nicolas, Chislehurst

7s. 6d.

THE hymns form the part of the service on which every member of the congregation expresses his opinion. This book is intended to give him the material on which to form a balanced judgment. With great learning, which is always carried lightly, it discusses the hymns of the Early Church and of the Eastern and Latin Churches.

After a glance at German hymns it discusses the matchless heritage of the English people.

A shorter second part deals with the policy which should be followed to-day in the choice of hymns and the compilation of future hymn-books.

The Appendices provide much valuable information in tabular form.

SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE
NORTHUMBERLAND AVENUE, LONDON, W.C. 2

THEOLOGY

A Monthly Journal of Historic Christianity

Edited by the Very Rev. S. C. Carpenter, D.D., The Deanery, Exeter, to whom MSS. should be sent. Reviews and all business communications should be addressed to S.P.C.K., Northumberland Avenue, London, W.C. 2.

Vol. XXXVI JANUARY, 1938 No. 211

EDITORIAL

A Happy New Year to our readers! The words were written as long ago as mid-November, and by the time that they are read the writer will have been for four weeks across the Atlantic, preparing to return after a crowded and, no doubt, rather exhausting visit to Canada and U.S.A. None the less, perhaps even rather more, the good wishes for the New Year are seriously intended. Distance, even a projected distance which stretches only in imagination, lends enthusiasm to the views, that is, the thoughts and hopes, entertained by even a prospective exile for his native land. He will no doubt have proved by some experience what, at the moment of writing, he is disposed to believe, that certain other countries of the world, not least U.S.A. and Canada, are looking towards Britain as a place where a very interesting experiment has been in progress for a long time and is by no means finished yet. The experiment is that of democracy, not wholly free, but free to a considerable extent, and with a good deal of Christianity about it. It is no good pretending that ours is a perfect democracy, or that Britain—or, anyhow, England—is a Christian country, but we have a fairly large measure of freedom and some Christianity. It is not arrogant to believe that on what happens in our country in the next generation will depend, not a little, what happens in several other parts of the world. The chief apprehension that needs to be felt about the range of British influence arises from the formidable fact that thoroughgoing Christianity, the kind that is victorious, is not very extensive among us, and that the mild version of it, which is all that most of us have developed, does not greatly impress outsiders. A good deal of our dynamite has gone rather stale. We have not very much of the strong quality. But we are expecting further supplies. A quite recent symposium, *The Recall to Religion* (Eyre and

337953

Spottiswoode, 8s. 6d.) indicates the quality of the supplies which are procurable, if a demand can be stimulated.

These reflections pave the way for a consideration of a letter from a correspondent about Anglicanism. Some comments on a previous letter of his appeared in the October number. The comments were of an Anglican complexion, intended to discourage what is sometimes known as "Westernizing." Our correspondent begins with a criticism of our editorial style of which it would be a shame to deprive our readers. He says: "What is wrong with your answer, as with most of your editorials, is that, instead of saying what you have to say in an intelligible way, you do little else but run off on a tangent on to other matters, and wrap it all up in a mass of literary allusions, which makes it difficult to grasp your real meaning." It has to be admitted that our October editorial did contain allusions to Goldsmith, Johnson, A. P. Herbert, the Epistle to Diognetus, R.L.S., Browning, G. K. Chesterton, Virgil, Milton and *Tom Brown's School Days*. But is that fatal? Does that destroy logic? Does an argument become worthless if it should happen to be coloured? Do tacks hold less securely when they have brass heads? "Run off on a tangent" is, of course, a matter of opinion, but it may be remembered that the editorial in question was a treatment *seriatim* of four points which had been raised by our correspondent.

All this is of very slight importance. But the letter continues: "My complaint about the Book of Common Prayer is that its worst features were set down in their present form to make them different from the old form of service. The Second Act of Uniformity itself allowed that the Prayer Book of 1549 was a very godly order, agreeable to the Word of God and the primitive Church. In spite of that it was considered necessary to split Cranmer's canon into three sections, not because it was a bad canon, but to destroy any likeness it might bear to the Canon of the rest of the Western Church or indeed any other canon. This desire to be different from the Roman Church merely for the sake of being different is schismatical in spirit, and is what is really wrong with the general outlook of the Church of England. It appeared again in the Deposited Book. There we are provided with a mangled form of the Eastern Canon, not because the Eastern Canon is better than

the Western Canon, but in order that any canon which is given us may not be like the Canon of the rest of the Western Church. We all know that this new form of canon is bad in that it contravenes the whole of the Western Theology of Consecration which has held the field for many hundreds of years. The same schismatical spirit I maintain is at the bottom of many people's objections to the introduction of Western ceremonial and ritual into the Church of England. People wish to be different merely for the sake of being different. Instead of trying to heal the schism, they are intent on maintaining it."

This is serious. The charge of being schismatical is a grave charge. But we plead "Not Guilty." At least to the main charge of deliberate schism. Anyone may fall at times into the schismatic temper. It is a common sin, detestable of course, but not beyond the hope of forgiveness. But as a matter of truth, a matter to be decided by the intelligent judgment, we submit that to be Anglican is not to be schismatic. If it were, there would be no justification for the continued existence of the Church of England, and the sin would not be ended by following the liturgical custom which our correspondent recommends, viz., that of "borrowing from the traditional practice of the rest of the Western Church." If it is true that the more we can assimilate ourselves to the rest of the Western Church the better, and if it is true that any English variety is always to be deprecated, then there is no case for the Church of England. If it is true that any Canon which contravenes the whole of the Western Theology of Consecration is bad, then there is no case for the Orthodox Churches. Rome is the standard. Rome alone is right.

In point of fact the case for the Church of England is twofold. And the one argument stands a long way ahead of the other. The prime consideration is that of truth. The Reformation was a breaking away from the mediæval Western Christendom which had held the field. Why? Because the Reformers believed that mediæval Western Christendom had gone wrong. They thought that they had found a truer way. There was variety of conviction among them. Luther, Calvin and Zwingli were all different from one another, and the line of Cranmer, Parker, Hooker, Andrewes, Laud, Hammond, Cosin among ourselves represents another form of the conviction. But all agreed in believing that intellectual sincerity demanded an Exodus or a Return from Captivity of a kind which would

certainly be described by the Egyptians or the Babylonians as schismatic. Of course there was tragedy in what came to pass. We say to ourselves, " If Erasmus had been a man of stouter moral calibre, if the Counter-Reformation had come about a century earlier, if Henry VIII and Charles I could have changed places, and Charles had been the contemporary of Luther, and Henry had been beheaded at the age of forty-nine, or earlier if possible, how different it all might have been !" Even apart from these imaginings, it is plain that there was grave loss. That loss we have been during the last hundred years gradually making good. But in what seems to us as the true way. The canons of truth must govern us. Richard Hooker looked out into the vast world of theological truth and saw that there was a way, neither Papist nor Puritan. He blazed the trail. It was what we should call the Anglican understanding of the Catholic religion. He called it Protestant, for that was the language of the time. In his sense of the word, the Church of England is still, and will always be as long as there is need for it, a Protestant communion. It does not dream of claiming to have the only way. In fact, whenever it hears anybody say, " Ours is the only way," it is sure that, whatever else is right, that must be wrong. It only claims to have a way, to which it has been led by a regard for truth.

The other argument—and it is obvious that neither can be more than barely touched here—is that it really was desired at the Reformation, and it is still desired by Anglicans, to have their Christianity in a national form. There is danger in this. Pulpits were illegitimately tuned by Henry VIII, by his son, and by both his daughters, and there is danger of it still, though not from monarchs. But our national experience, political and of other kinds, has made us what we are. Our character affects our interpretation of the Christian Faith. It was natural a dozen years ago that Barthianism should appeal to post-war Germany by reason of both what had been and what was in that country. They had before been accustomed to absolutism, and after the war they needed something drastic to stiffen them in their despair. It is natural, on the other hand, that Britons should speak of the co-operation of man with God in a way that is abhorred by true Barthians. That is our tradition. We are accustomed to act and live like that, and so we think like that. Truth is, of course, the dominant consideration, but our approach, our scale of values, our judgments are affected by national tradition. It is possible, of course, to be extravagantly, absurdly, falsely insular. Let

it even be conceded that " insularity " is itself a defect. There ought to be a pair of words, perhaps even three, like sensible, sensuous and sensual. We suggest " insulariousness," a hint of the undoubted and not disparaging fact that islanders inevitably have an islandic quality. In the happy event of the reunion of Western Christendom we should still have it, though the tension would then resemble that of football rather than that of war or of armed frontiers. God send the blessed day when the controversies between Churches will be no worse than a competition between Rome, Constantinople, Lambeth and Geneva for a sort of ecclesiastical Nobel Prize.

DEVOTION AT COMMUNION IN CHRISTIAN ANTIQUITY AND IN THE MIDDLE AGES

[THE following article is translated from the Belgian *Les Questions Liturgiques et Paroissiales* (June, 1937), where it is printed as a résumé of part of an article written by Père Browe in the Jahrbuch für Liturgiewissenschaft, 1935. The earlier section dealt with the Priest's prayers at Communion. (Those now ordered in the Roman Missal were selected out of a large variety.) This latter part is based on a study of the Communion prayers of the people in early Christian times and in the Middle Ages. The contrast is so interesting and suggestive as to deserve a wider public. It is given here (with the omission of one long illustrative passage in Latin) as printed in *Les Questions Liturgiques et Paroissiales*, mainly in Père Browe's own words (in inverted commas), with occasional summaries of passages omitted (between square brackets).—HENRY DE CANDOLE.]

"IN early days, every Christian assisting at the eucharistic sacrifice received, as a general practice, the food of the sacrifice in Holy Communion. The only preparation for the Sacrament was the personal offering of bread and wine at the Offertory, the recitation with the rest of the congregation of part of the prayers of the Mass, the common responses to the priest's prayers, and conformity in attitude or acts to the prescribed ceremonies. Without more preparation, the faithful Christian approached at the given moment the Holy Table. The common phrase was 'to receive the sacrifice,' 'to receive the Body and Blood of Christ,' the expression 'to receive Christ' being somewhat rare. Attention was directed rather to the material side of Communion, the eucharistic food, than to the Person of Him Who gives Himself under the sacred species. Western authors speak very rarely of 'the King Who comes to meet us' or of 'the Guest Whom we receive into our souls.'

"The communicant did not feel the need for special prayers. Animated by deep faith in the mystery in which he had come to take part, he was naturally hungry for the divine food. Instead of addressing directly the Person of Christ, as was customary later, attention was fixed entirely on the representation of His sacrificial death, renewed at the altar, and on His flesh and blood, which, following that immolation, He gives for food. Apart from this active participation in the holy sacrifice, no other immediate preparation, no other act of thanksgiving, surrounded Holy Communion. The latter was regarded purely as an *act* of liturgical worship, not as a means of help in the practice of virtue. Under this moral aspect,

Communion is scarcely considered at all in the ascetic writings of Christian antiquity. The *Lives of the Fathers*, for instance, which describes in detail all the methods of asceticism and all their moral exercises, only mention Holy Communion in the closest connection with the holy sacrifice of the Mass.

"The sacred meal created among early Christians the most vivid sense that they formed a community. Thanks to Communion, they were conscious to a degree unknown in following centuries that they were united with each other, united to Christ, grafted into His mystical Body as members of the great Catholic Church. Communion was the bond of charity. Of that union in charity the kiss of peace was the symbol. In that union the community of Christians militant on earth realized their oneness with the Church of the elect, perfect and complete in heaven. The prayer in the Canon *Supplices te* was recited with that thought: 'We most humbly beseech Thee, Almighty God, to command that these offerings be borne by the hands of Thine angel to Thine altar on high, in the sight of Thy divine majesty.' In old days the faithful took that prayer literally. Later they were content to keep the leading thought that the sacrifice, performed on earth, was present also at the heavenly altar in the presence of God and His saints.

"The Mass was thus supremely an act of common worship, the sacred action of the community, of all the saints, performed at once and in common by Christ and His Church, by priest and lay folk. The worshipper did not think primarily of himself or his own needs; he took his part, as a member of the community, in the sacrificial rite and sacred meal. Thus individual prayers or personal requests, which later took the principal place, remained in the background. 'Devotion' towards Communion was identified with faith in the sacrifice offered in common and an eager desire to participate sacramentally in union with the community."

[This conception of the Eucharist remained until the Middle Ages, and practice confirmed it with remarkable consistency. But changes gradually appear which already herald the later form of eucharistic piety. In early days the general rule was one altar only in each church; on this single altar a single sacrifice was offered at which the whole community was present. Soon, however, priests became accustomed to say masses in their own right without the assembly of the faithful at the altar. At that moment the intimate connection between the sacrifice and Communion was broken. It became usual to assist at Mass when the celebrant alone received Communion. The Offering and Communion thus became, in the eyes of the

faithful, separate and distinct acts of which one could be performed without the other. The result was a grievous break in the close liturgical connection of the two, a break responsible for a new form of devotion to the Eucharist, considered separately. This became further emphasized when on feast days or special occasions when the faithful were accustomed to receive, Communion was distributed also out of Mass.

Other motives, doctrinal and practical, turned the devotion of the faithful in the same direction. Among these factors, Père Browe enumerates the disputes, from the fourth century onwards, about the Unity of the Person and Duality of the Natures of Christ; in the ninth century, the dispute about the Real Presence of the Body and Blood of Christ, on which was grafted two centuries later the problem of the mode of that Presence. These dogmatic disputes fixed the attention of the faithful successively on the divinity and the humanity of Christ, and suggested to the Church their separate proposal for faith and worship. Further, in some popular quarters the veneration of the " Sorrowful Christ " had found a place, and by the time of the Crusades this form of piety became general.

From the liturgical point of view, devotion at Mass and Communion was centred henceforward more on the historic Person of the Saviour, and the more easily since the rôle of the people was no longer the same in the celebration of the sacrifice.]

" In fact, the people no longer understood the language used by the celebrant; they no longer sang nor prayed together with him; they no longer themselves brought the elements for the sacrifice at the Offertory in the Mass, nor communicated, save rarely, on the great festivals. In the personal religious experience of the faithful, the central point of the Mass was no longer the offering and the sacred meal of Communion, but the consecration. Henceforward that came to dominate every other moment in the Mass and was soon surrounded by new ceremonial and outward veneration.

" But, amid all these developments, the person of the priest became more and more radically isolated from the lay worshippers. Henceforward it is the priest alone who offers, who alone communicates, who alone recites a whole series of prayers, which the whole community had formerly sung or recited with him. He was scarcely interrupted even by the occasional voice of the server. This isolation found its consecration and completion in the new orientation of the altar. So we find at this period the altars turned round, so that the priest shows his back to the faithful, except for a few moments

when he turns to salute them or invite them to pray. Consequently, the object of the congregation's devotion became altered. More and more it was separated from what took place at the altar and the prayers there said."

[There were obviously praiseworthy exceptions. Père Browe quotes the case of St. Gertrude of Helfta, who with her nuns followed faithfully the ceremonies of the Mass and the words of the celebrant. But he adds that even in this instance the psychological attitude, the subjective piety, was no longer the same as before. As to ordinary folk, they were certainly not helped to unite themselves with what was passing at the altar by the numerous *Explanations of the Mass*, which gained a great vogue at that time. Allegory and symbolism struggled in them with wild explanations and fantastic inventions. Soon the general tendency was to find in each detail of the Mass a dramatic representation of an incident in the life of Christ.

The great authorities, such as Innocent III, set the tone. And the official teaching, prescribed by certain provincial councils, moves in the same realm of thought.]

(One of these documents, *De Significatione Missæ*, issued in 1289 for the diocese of Cahors and others, is then printed at full length. We have not thought it necessary to reproduce here. [Translator.])

[Similar *Explanations* had long been in circulation. Many of them are pure fantasy. Others are not lacking in spiritual depth and good sense. But they insist always on the allegorical and moral aspects. To writers of ability and theologians who copied them or took inspiration from them they afforded opportunity, in default of sound doctrine, for exercising their literary imagination. When Albert the Great, in reaction against this type of treatise, wrote his *Opus de Mysterio Missæ*, that admirable effort at theological and ascetic explanation could not stem the prevailing current. This kind of interpretation, says Père Browe, fitted mediæval piety too well to be so easily dethroned.]

" The Christian of that date had lost the sense of cohesion which had bound the faithful of the previous age so firmly together into living communities. He no longer experienced the joy they took in liturgical prayer, its objectivity and serenity, and in the simple fulfilment in common of the ritual Mystery. His mentality had altered. The Christian now wanted to pray and meditate in isolation, to achieve a greater liberty and independence. He tried to express more fully in his own prayer his personal sentiments and religious temperament. He needed a form of prayer, steeped in feeling, through which his piety—sometimes sentimental in character—could

give free rein to his imagination and his tendency to express everything in concrete images. Thus he found himself at home in subjective contemplation on our Lord's Life and Passion; he opened his heart in direct addresses to Jesus and in devotion towards the 'Guest of his soul.' The Roman prayers seemed too impersonal, too unimpassioned, too objective to satisfy this kind of piety. To pray with the priest and join his actions was, like the faithful performance of the ceremonial requirements, not enough for this new devotion. Further, by neglect of these traditional practices, it was open to him to seek for an expression in prayer of his own personal tastes and immediate needs. So his prayer, even when assisting at Mass, became chiefly utilitarian. He was scarcely aware that his presence at the sacred rite was in order to offer to God, in union with the priest, the sacrifice of Christ."

[His centre of attention thus differed entirely from that of Christians of the previous age, since he recited prayers which had no connection with the Mass. The saints set the tone. Elizabeth of Schoenau had visions during the holy sacrifice and heard messages quite alien to the Mass, by which she received instruction on a variety of subjects.

Many souls shewed a marked predilection for the contemplation of the Passion, wounds and Death of Christ. Attempts were made to discover in the ceremonies and text of the Mass the whole series of Stations of the Cross. This was in fact one of the chief devotions of the Middle Ages—sometimes expressed by reading the story of the Passion or religious books which commented on it; at other times, such meditation gave an opportunity for pious souls to receive visions, in which they were united with Christ in mystic experiences. In such meditation supremely such souls found their "spiritual food," from which they gave the practice its name of "the soul's spiritual nourishment," or even "spiritual Communion." A German preacher of the first half of the thirteenth century could write: "He who meditates on the Passion of the Lord with all his heart and with sustained attention receives the Saviour into his soul, exactly as if he received Him really in Communion."

Understood in this sense, spiritual Communion was completely unknown to Christian antiquity. In the Middle Ages it became a very frequent theme of sermons and ascetic writings, relying mostly on the phrase of St. Augustine, *Crede et manducasti*. Augustine was speaking solely of the spiritual union with Christ established by faith and love. Yet this phrase came to serve as the sanction of the "Communion of desire," for this latter term quickly came to express what the early

Middle Ages had called spiritual Communion, understood simply as meditation on the Passion.

Sacramental Communion became rare, and more and more insistence was laid on the value and fruits of this substitute, till it fell into obvious exaggerations. Theologians swam with the current. Without making the elementary distinction between the *opus operatum* and the *opus operantis*, the majority of the Pre-scholastics established a parallel between the effects of the two kinds of Communion, ending with their close affinity, if not their equivalence. Stephen Langton attempted a reaction, but without success: the current was too strong. Père Browe quotes a whole series of preachers of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. One writes, for instance, " As Mary bore her God within her in purest love, so you receive God into your heart.' The great St. Gertrude herself, while admitting it as a paradox and inexplicable mystery, does not fall far short of recognizing the same effects in spiritual, as in sacramental, Communion. Other mystics cross the border-line. Mechtilde of Waldeck († 1305) declares that Christ had taught her in a vision that spiritual Communion was as good as that of the priest at the altar, and its effects more certain than those of sacramental Communion. Further could not be said !

The Catechism of the Council of Trent has retained an echo of this line of spirituality when it attributes to spiritual Communion " very great advantages."

What, asks Père Browe, were the conditions required for spiritual Communion ? Devout souls clearly had a sincere desire and real longing for sacramental Communion. For such, spiritual Communion was considered as a preparation for union with Christ through the sacrament. But this desire for sacramental Communion was not always required. It could not be normally among lay folk, content to communicate once, twice or thrice a year. For them it was enough to make an act of faith in the Real Presence, to look up devoutly at the Sacred Host or assist piously at Mass, for (says Berthold of Ratisbon) " the faithful form one great body with the priest, who is the mouth of the body."

Often indeed no more is suggested than that the faithful should meditate with recollection on the Passion or propitiatory death of Christ. This exercise continued to be called " spiritual Communion," without any necessity to think either of sacrifice or of Communion. No less a person than St. Bonaventura affirms, " In hoc anima perfecte reficitur et delectatur." Only in the fifteenth century is found some regret for sacramental Communion, and spiritual Communion becomes clearly a " Communion of desire."

Just as this spiritual Communion was surrounded by all sorts of prayers, the reception of the Sacrament too was accompanied by formulas of self-deprecation. But the relation to the sacrifice was lost from view. The idea that the communicant is sharing in a sacrificial and social meal appears only sporadically. The Presence of Christ, sacrificial and propitiatory, is seldom remembered, and when the sacrament is thought of, it is not generally under this aspect that it is considered. Communion prayers have now only a very distant connection with the sacred action. Often they are meditations on the sufferings of Christ, so that the host was frequently called in Germany *das Jammerbrot*, the bread of affliction. Eckhart and many other popular writers speak in this way, while monastic circles, especially nunneries, are in the full stream of this influence. During the whole period of the end of the Middle Ages and in modern times, devotion to the Five Wounds and the Holy Blood hold a favourite place among such exercises. The Precious Blood of Christ—from the end of the thirteenth century, in some parts, the Heart of Christ —was the symbol of the Saviour's generous love. Under that symbol the Christian honoured his Redeemer, with thankfulness for the forgiveness of his sins.

Père Browe then proceeds to describe the general impression gained from all this literature, and to draw some conclusions on the contrast with the liturgical prayers and piety of early Christian ages.]

"No doubt many of these prayers breathe a great love of Christ and a burning devotion towards the Sacrament of the Eucharist. But one cannot be blind to a quite different tone and spirit from that which supported Christians of the first thousand years. The latter followed closely the liturgical action; they prayed in union with the priest, and, thus prepared, received the fruits, the food of the sacrifice. Particular devotion to Communion and preparation for that apart from the Mass were unknown to them. In the Middle Ages, by contrast, Communion had become a rite, an independent religious action, for which the communicant prepared by special prayers, detached from the normal surroundings of the sacred feast.

"Such a habit carried with it the possibility of danger, not always avoided.

"Communion was no longer an action of corporate worship, a confession of common faith, and a common participation in the sacrificial and propitiatory death of Christ, and thus an act also of adoration from the whole community of the faithful. It had become, on the contrary, a private affair, the principal object of which was to obtain help for individual needs and the

satisfaction of one's own desires. It was regarded as a *means* of perfection, to obtain chastity, honesty, ascetic perfection. Only in the second place was it regarded as a sharing in the sacrifice of Christ, as an act of praise and glory to God, through Him.

"Another danger consisted in the attitude taken towards the Eucharistic Presence of Christ. No doubt the dogmatic conception had not altered. The belief was always held that Christ is present on the altar by virtue of the words of consecration, and that His Body and Blood are the Food of the members of His mystical Body. But according as one or other of these aspects occupy the foreground of piety, one of two attitudes will appear towards Christ and the sharing in His sacrifice, which in their turn influence the method of receiving Holy Communion. In early days, following the words of Scripture, 'He that eateth My Flesh and drinketh My Blood hath Eternal Life,' the faithful spoke of receiving the food of the sacrifice, of Communion in the Body and the Blood. Along the same line of thought, the liturgical prayers speak constantly of Communion in the sacrifice. In later ages, on the contrary, the Presence of the God-Man came up for direct consideration; and inspired by that other word of Christ, 'He that eateth Me shall live because of Me,' Christians spoke more readily of the Sacrament of their beloved Saviour, of 'the Divine Guest of the soul,' Whom the communicant receives and for Whose visit he prepares. Naturally, too, Communion and the devotion which accompanied it soon became tinged with elements much more subjective and affective. The time was not long before such devotion came sometimes to degenerate into sentimental piety of doubtful value.

"The priest himself came to make before his Communion direct invocations and addresses to the Saviour, and in many cases, both among religious and laity, this habit became transformed into a separate and complicated exercise of devotion. About 400 a nun enumerates thirty-seven *sentimenta simplicia* and fourteen *sentimenta complexa* for the soul to recite before receiving the sacred species! Among the abundance of prayers at Communion very few are inspired by, or bear the mark of, the Liturgy. Side by side with some formulas of great beauty and charm, there are also a large number that are sentimental and even dangerous. In many convents of women a mawkish devotion to Jesus developed which found its phraseology by preference in the Song of Songs. The invocations of that book were addressed to the Divine Spouse with sentiments of desire and of union, whose purely religious quality could not always be assured. If St. Mechtilde could write, 'He gives Himself

wholly to me, He offers His mouth as a flower to be kissed, and opens His arms to embrace me,' and not set on these burning aspirations more than a purely spiritual desire of union, how many others would find it difficult to save themselves from the snare of words, and use such exclamations in a sense entirely pure and elevated !

" Let us grant even that the majority did avoid the snare of an unhealthy sentimentality. There remained another danger in this affective piety towards Communion. It came to be regarded, in fact, and that soon, as a necessary preparation for regular and frequent reception of the Eucharist. Consequently it rendered frequent Communion impossible or very difficult. For all who could not attain to these ' transports ' of piety, who did not ' languish ' with longing, or who had any difficulty in feeling sensible devotion, were quite simply set down as unworthy of Communion.

" It goes without saying," Père Browe concludes, " that not all the pious souls of the Middle Ages were exposed to these dangers. Many of them practised this new devotion with tact and good sense. Nor can one say that the idea of the sacrificial and propitiatory death of Christ had been altogether forgotten, or was no longer alive. The idea of the representation in the Mass of the death of Christ on the Cross had always persisted, and in dogmatic or theoretical treatises remained central. But the methods of participation in the sacrifice and of Communion were no longer directed by that thought. Communion had become an exercise of piety of a separate kind; no longer a collective act of worship, but rather an individual and subjective devotion the principal object of which was the comfort of the soul and the satisfaction of its desire for God. This development of piety has sometimes degenerated and borne unhealthy fruit. But we cannot say that this point of view is radically false or to be entirely condemned. For this reason the Church was able to tolerate it and to take it under her maternal supervision in order to guide it the better."

ROME AND REUNION

That " there can be no fulfilment of the Divine purpose in any scheme of reunion which does not ultimately include the great Latin Church of the West, with which our history has been so closely associated in the past, and to which we are still bound by so many ties of common faith and tradition," is a

statement made by the Lambeth Conference in 1908 and endorsed in 1920 and 1930. At every world-conference of Christians regrets are expressed that Roman Catholic delegates are not there. But when the Roman Catholic Church does enter the œcumenical arena and begin to make its weight felt, it is inevitable that those discussions will undergo a deep change; perspectives will be altered, questions will appear in a different light, and a new era in those discussions will begin.

That this is in process of happening would seem to be proved by a variety of events which are taking place—not, for the most part, in public—and not least by the recent publication of a book by a French Dominican, Fr. M. J. Congar, entitled *Chrétiens désunis : principes d'un " œcumenisme " catholique* (Les Editions du Cerf, Paris, 1937, 35 frs. I understand that an English translation is being taken in hand). It is a book of 400 pages, and contains a thorough study of the problems of the separation of Orthodox, Protestants and Anglicans from Rome. A book that adopted an anglicanizing, or modernizing, or liberalizing position might be dismissed as a book which the Roman Catholic Church would repudiate; but this is not the case here. It is indeed full of an ardent desire for the return of all Christians into unity, and of a sincere and humble charity towards other sorts of Christians, and of a sustained endeavour to see what their points of view actually are; the spirit which animates it throughout is expressed in the words " Whoever has once been gripped by anguish over the unity between Christians which has been lost and is to be recovered, has lost the right to refuse to go to the limit of his loyalty, his endeavours, his courage, and of unreserved self-oblation " (p. 3). But it is definitely a Roman Catholic book, and its main principles, so far as a non-Roman can judge, would commend themselves to any good Roman Catholic. Therefore, desiring unity only in the truth, the author is compelled at times to say things which must seem hard, to us Anglicans as well as to others. But this is just what makes the book to be one of quite first-rate importance; and we make bold to assert that a knowledge of it ought to be presupposed in all future discussions about Christian unity. It contains what is usually missing in those discussions, a positive doctrine of the visible unity of the Church.

It is not possible in a short article to do more than skim the surface of a book of this calibre. One can only give, first, a general idea of the method of approach; second, of what he has to say about Anglicanism; and, thirdly, offer some few comments and reflections.

I

Chapter i deals with the actual state of Christendom. There is first the Orthodox East; and as a bald summary of what is said here and in chapter vi would be worse than useless, I must skip this part, and hope that we may have a review of it from some Orthodox theologian or some competent Anglican. The general tone of what is said about the Orthodox may be inferred from the rest.

There is Continental Protestantism. With regard to the state of the Church in the later Middle Ages, *on a tout dit sur ce sujet*: "the frequent ignorance of the priests, the immorality of many in high and low place, the avarice of many clergy, the eagerness to claim rights, the disposition of many churchmen to lose, for the sake of selfish advantage, even the most elementary sense of apostolic zeal and a pure and simple Christian and evangelical mind. . . ." Testimonies to the sin of the mediæval Church from Pope Adrian VI and Cardinal Pole are quoted in an appendix (pp. 355-7).

Now a heresy is always the exaggerated and one-sided (*unilatéral*) affirmation of some truth. Luther's *sola gratia* and Calvin's *soli Deo gloria* were bits of Catholic truth, isolated from their context and developed separately to their logical consequences. "In this sense, we think that Lutheranism and Calvinism, taken not in their separate dogmatic development, but in their positive and original religious inspiration, are truly capable of being integrated with the Church: or rather that they exist IN THE CHURCH, but not as LUTHERANISM or CALVINISM: that they are parts of the Church's indivisible inheritance. If, on the other hand, we take these same religious inspirations in their tragically logical development as abstract, autonomous, one-sided affirmations, they pass out of the Catholic orbit and constitute themselves into a body in which truth is mixed with error" (p. 55; capitals as in the original). To illustrate: take the authentically Catholic experience of Augustine, sever its living connections with the whole life of the Church universal, formulate the consequences in a one-sided way and you have—Jansenism. The same affirmations which were orthodox in 415 in Augustine are heretical in 1640 in Jansenius. They are heretical in Jansenius, because affirmed according to an abstract and autonomous logic, whose rule is not the life of the *Catholica*, but the text of Augustine. We must note also that on the Catholic side the reply to the one-sidedness of heresy may be almost equally one-sided, if its aim is principally to refute the falsehoods which the heretics assert;

therefore it will fail to do justice to the width and fulness of the Catholic truth.

But modern Protestantism is very different from that of the sixteenth century. It has undergone an evolution, such that it has become difficult for Catholics and modern Protestants even to understand one another, since they do not use words in the same sense. " The principle of secularization, naturalism, rationalism, which in our view was latent in Protestantism from the start, has developed into the movement which has ended in Liberalism, so that at last Christianity has been reduced to an aspect of the moral consciousness of humanity; and this is even called ' the worship in spirit and in truth.' As a result of having treated the Church's dogma and her forms of worship and order as ' the letter that killeth,' men have come to profess a ' religion of the spirit ' in which faith becomes a religious sentiment, revelation the word of God to the conscience, and the interior testimony of the Spirit private judgment " (p. 42). Hence a dialogue with undogmatic Liberalism is next to impossible, and it is not very much easier with the dialectical theology of Barth.

To be sure, the life of the Protestant communities in the parishes has never become thoroughly liberalized or thoroughly Barthian. But conversations must begin with the leaders, and " reunion with Protestants, more perhaps than with any other separated Christians, will have to have its basis in theological labour and theological conviction " (p. 43).

From the other side, there are the charges against Rome: *Legalism*, in that she seems to them to be like a worldly State, and even the relation of the Catholic with his God is held to be a sort of commercial and legal relation, based on the notions of merit and satisfaction; *imperialism*, in that Catholics are regarded as subjects of the Pope, under a clerical system to which their consciences are enslaved, an ecclesiastical system of which the Pope is the autocrat; again, *the addition of human elements*, the invention of new dogmas, the adulteration of pure religion by practices often superstitious and always stale and flat, the loss of the sense of mystery and of the sovereignty of God and of the virility and power of the Gospel—" it is incredible, it is distressing, but so it is; such is the judgment which separated Christians, both Orthodox and Protestant, explicitly or implicitly pass on our post-tridentine Catholicism. All is summed up in a complaint which turns often to hatred: Rome, the Pope. The anti-Roman passion is psychologically if not ideologically the most real among the motives which keep our separated brethren away from us " (p. 41). Again: " Behind the causes which have made our divisions into

historical realities which continue in existence and impose themselves upon us: behind the accumulation of misunderstandings, rancours and prejudices, there is this: That which keeps our separated brethren from coming to us and being reincorporated with us in unity is the fear lest their religious values, that to which they hold at the deepest level of their souls, that in which they realize their union with Christ, should be damaged and lost, or should have to be left behind (as it were) at the door of the Church into which we invite them to be reunited with us in God " (p. 48). And " our Church appears to Christians who view it from outside as a particular confession, one system among others, an ' ism ' just as particular and exclusive as all the other ' isms ' " (p. 338).

But in truth the Church is One and is Catholic. (Two long chapters, ii and iii, are devoted to this theme; only a brief summary can be given here.) The Unity of the Church has its basis in the Unity of the Holy Trinity (John xvii. 11, 21, 22). The Church is One as being derived from Christ, as His mystical Body. She is composed of men; she is the People of God, first under the Old Covenant, then under the New. " The Church is nothing else than humanity reconciled to God in Christ." Christian unity in the Church has at once a heavenly substance and a human organized form; the Church is at once the mystical Body of Christ and the Divine Society on earth.

The Church is Catholic, not merely as being inclusive of all races, but also as being inclusive of all truth: the *pleroma*, *plénitude*, fulness of Him that filleth all in all. In His mystical Body Christ is made complete. The Catholicity of the Church derives from that of Christ. Therefore there is a close relation between the Church's Catholicity and her Unity. In contrast with the " œcumenism " alike of Stockholm-Oxford and of Lausanne-Edinburgh, which are attempts to introduce a certain unity into an already existing diversity (p. 125), the Catholicity of the Church starts from Unity and integrates the diversity into it; it is " extensio unitatis," " universalis capacitas unitatis."

Further, the Unity and the Catholicity of the Church must be accepted and believed in *as already existing*. The Church is and always has been One; otherwise, if the Unity were something still to be found, it would be we who by bringing reunion to pass had created the Unity of the Church. Similarly the Catholicity of the Church has existed from the beginning, because it exists in Christ. It is indeed true that the *actualization* or *realization* of the Church's inalienable Catholicity is a matter of degree; we might illustrate from a boy who, though he is by nature a rational creature, has not yet fully attained

the use and exercise of his reason. Similarly the Catholicity of the Church remains incomplete while (*e.g.*) Russia and the Slavonic contribution, Scandinavia and the Lutheran contribution, lie outside it. Nevertheless it is of the nature of the Catholic Church, the *Roman* Catholic Church, that it stands for Catholicity as against particularism. In the great words of St. Augustine:

" You say that the Church of Christ is among the Africans, in Africa: I say that the Church of Christ is spread through all nations. See what the question is, what is the ground of this contention between brethren. You are contending on behalf of a part, in order that you may remain in that part. I contradict you, in order that you may possess the whole. See, this is a strife of concord, a strife of love. I do not say to you, ' You are defeated, give way.' From the beginning our Lord Jesus Christ was displeased with those who would divide the inheritance; for once during His ministry one of the crowd said to Him, ' Lord, bid my brother that he divide the inheritance with me.' But the Lord had come to make unity—as we have just heard read in the Gospel, ' Other sheep I have which are not of this fold; them also I must bring, and they shall be one fold (*grex*), one Shepherd '—the Lord who loved unity hated division. . . . I do not say, ' Lord, bid my brother divide the inheritance with me '; but I say, ' Lord, bid my brother that he possess the inheritance with me ' " (*Sermo de ordinatione episcopi*, No. 11, quoted pp. 324-5; a motto from this passage is on the title-page).

II

The Church of England is dealt with in one long chapter (v), and elsewhere (pp. 24-6, 43, etc.). This part of Fr. Congar's book is up to the high level of the rest. He deals chiefly with the Catholic side of Anglicanism; deliberately, for he accepts it as, in his view, the true interpretation of the Anglican spirit. He knows well that Anglo-Catholicism is not the whole of Anglicanism, but he is perhaps unaware of the wide extension of Evangelicalism in the parishes and its great missionary work. His documentation is excellent; and he seems to be in error only in one point, in thinking that we have now full mutual intercommunion with the Church of Finland (p. 205, *cf.* 225). There are other points in which he seems not to have completely understood us; to these we shall return.

There were abuses in England, as elsewhere, in the later Middle Ages. Schism was not everywhere the inevitable consequence of these abuses; why was it in England ? It

would seem that the decisive thing was the lamentable affair of the divorce; and Henry VIII *was* heretical on the Royal Supremacy (p. 25). The Anglican Reformation, thus started, remained empirical and largely political in character. Protestant influences came in under Edward VI and Elizabeth, but the Church of England has never presented a Protestant system comparable to the Reformed Churches on the Continent, and indeed has always had a will to Catholicism (*une volonté de catholicisme*). The Anglican position is "a catholicism of doctrine and worship, seriously imperfect in fact, mutilated and damaged at more than one point, in an ecclesiastical organization that is national, autonomous, and schismatic" (p. 26).

Within 150 years from the Reformation, the Church of England had produced the important and relatively homogeneous group of the Caroline Divines, including Hooker, Andrewes, Laud, Jeremy Taylor, Cosin. Both here and in its modern theologians it shows a strong sense of the Incarnation, on which also its conception of the Church is based; hence in its view the outward expression of the essential unity of the Church requires not only the sacraments and the preaching of the word, but also an organized social life and the apostolic ministry. This stands in strong contrast with the Lutheran tendency to dissociate the visible and the invisible, and even to reduce the essence of Christianity to the message of forgiveness (pp. 189-91). Further, it has a strong sense of tradition and of its continuity with the mediæval Church—in clear contrast with Protestantism in general, which tends to put a gulf between the Apostolic Age and the Reformation, as if in becoming "catholic" the patristic Church suffered a fatal deterioration. We have the testimony of Leo XIII that the Anglicans have retained many "catholicas traditiones" (pp. 191-4). In a general way, but with certain definite reservations, the Scandinavian Churches and the High Church movement in Germany and elsewhere are to be grouped with Anglicanism (pp. 195-200).

Nevertheless, he says, we Catholics hold that the continuity was really broken (p. 186). We deny Anglican orders to be valid, on the ground of defect of intention; for it is the belief of a church which finally determines the sense of a rite. Continuity was broken by the breach in the transmission of the priesthood and of legitimate pastoral authority, and also of the doctrinal tradition of the Church and its magisterium. "The Anglican Church became, very soon, a body whose unity is sociological and historical, but not doctrinal. Affirmative and negative answers are possible and are actually given

with regard to the same things, and things which in our view belong to the very substance of the Faith. We cannot regard as possessing the true and full unity of the Church a body in which it is possible not only to live but also to exercise authority, while denying the Virgin Birth of Christ and the historical fact of His Resurrection. We have no desire to draw up a list of these inconsistencies, still less to use them as a pin to prick with. But we cannot be silent about them altogether, for they belong to the substance of the Church of England, and they form part of the Anglican view of things which confronts us. They are proudly dressed up with the name of 'the glorious comprehensiveness of the Church of England.' But this is to make a merit of that which is really a weakness, such as neither St. Augustine, St. Leo, nor St. Athanasius would have condoned" (pp. 186-7).

Yet the Anglicans have done very much already in the cause of the unity of Christians; and Roman Catholics "should have no motive to regret, or even to regard with any *arrière-pensée* the Anglo-Orthodox rapprochement" which has been taking place in recent years. For till the full reunion with the Church comes, lesser unions are all moves in the right direction, and "every defeat of particularism makes for unity" (p. 204). The friendship of Orthodox and Anglicans is good for them both; it helps to break down the alienation of the Orthodox from Western tradition, and it teaches the Anglicans a fuller idea of the meaning of the Church.

Anglican Orders have been accepted as valid by several Orthodox ecclesiastical authorities, and lately by Rumania. Intercommunion is not likely to follow soon, for in the Orthodox view it presupposes community of faith, and they hesitate before certain insufficiencies in the XXXIX Articles and "the truly disconcerting doctrinal liberalism of the Anglican Church" (p. 202). But in truth there are several real points of contact between Orthodoxy and Anglicanism: (*a*) a similar view of Authority, regarded as "an interior law spontaneously obeyed, a collective discipline immanent in the community, rather than an external authority exercised upon subjects"; (*b*) a Platonic sacramentalism whereby "to every visible thing there corresponds a heavenly counterpart which the visible thing manifests";* (*c*) a view of the liturgy and of worship, "regarded not so much as a 'duty to God' but rather as the reality and the moment in which the Christian is most truly himself and most truly expresses what he is, as a man regenerate and transformed by grace" (pp. 203-4).

* A sound observation this, of which, in our view, more might have been made in an estimate of Anglicanism.

The Anglicans have also been in contact with the Christians of the Protestant side; for the Church of England is looking in both directions, and seeking for the way of union also with the English Free Churches and other Protestant communities. "An honourable desire this, but also a deceptive game (*jeu décevant*)—the answers that have been given have often been not encouraging—and a dangerous game" (Presbyterian negotiations, South Indian scheme, Finland*); for "to accept the principle of a real equivalence between the 'spiritual' ministry of the sects and the sacramental ministry of the Church derived from the apostolic and hierarchical charisma" would surely be to compromise the opportunity of the Church of England to work for the reintegration of Christendom (p. 205). It is sometimes said, with regard to Intercommunion, that "If we keep the spirit of the apostolic salutation 'Peace be to all that truly love Christ,' a common loyalty to our Lord Jesus Christ, a true devotion to His person, and a humble trust in His work should form a bond sufficient to allow those whose teaching is different to meet at the Lord's Table"; Fr. Congar's comment is, "But these are interior sentiments, concerning which the Church is absolutely unable to judge, and which therefore cannot be made criteria of ecclesiastical communion" (pp. 202-3, n.).

With regard to Rome, there have been the Malines Conversations (pp. 204-12). The results may seem to have been negative; clearly the publicity given to the Conversations was harmful, "and here we have without doubt a warning for the future"; clearly also it was the last of the Conversations (1926) that gave rise to misgivings and criticisms from the Roman side. But it would be wrong to conclude that the Conversations were in vain—far from it—nor can we regret that Bishop Gore came in, anti-papalist as he was. The positive importance of the Conversations was that they proved to Anglicans that Roman Catholics are "possible" people, and have thus sown seed the fruitfulness of which it is not yet possible to estimate. "Certainly the doctrinal differences are very serious; but what makes them insurmountable is the fixed prior conviction that they cannot be surmounted. After all, the questions have all been stated and the answers given long since; but what has generally been lacking has been the desire that the answers should be effective, and the belief that the Catholic position was a *possible* one" (pp. 210-11).

But the central question is that of the Anglican conception of the Unity of the Church. What does it mean "to be a Catholic"? For us Roman Catholics it means to be a member

* Here, as it seems, there is a misunderstanding; see p. 14, above.

of the One Church of Jesus Christ, in communion with the Apostolic See. But the Anglicans construe the notion concretely and pragmatically; for them it means to receive the concrete inheritance of that which is catholic, Scripture, Creeds, Sacraments, and Ministry, and to " enter into the communion of that which has been held and lived always, everywhere, and by all." The distinction is made between the *esse* and the *bene esse*, between that which is fundamental and that which is not; and that which is fundamental is summed up in the famous Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral. Hence the idea of a " Catholicism " shared by Rome and by the Orthodox and the Anglicans and the Old-Catholics and various other groups; and we get the notion of " non-Roman Catholicism," " Northern Catholicism."

The Church of England does not claim to be *the* Church but only *a* Church.* Hence the famous Branch Theory. Equally in its older and its newer forms it envisages, not a multitude forming one society, but one spiritual life shared by various communions, having differences of belief and practice, and also at present outwardly divided. The differences are inevitable and in a sense normal; the divisions are infinitely regrettable. Yet these divided Churches are even now in a sense one, according to Fr. Rosenthal's distinction between *unity* and *union*; a family divided by quarrels has still a certain unity, but it does not attain to union till its members are reconciled (pp. 218-21).

Hence, for these Anglicans, the way of reunion must lie in the mutual recognition of the various communions by one another; not in the absorption by one communion of all the rest. None of the various communions *is* the Church; and the future œcumenical Church is to be the rich synthesis of all the Churches which at present are divided, yet are one in their source and in their inner nature. Many Anglican statements may be quoted to this effect; the central place is given to a statement by Bishop Headlam at the Lausanne Conference (p. 224): " The Gospel of Christ is far deeper and fuller than anything which any one man or any one nation could grasp. All the different nations and churches of the world bring their honour and glory to the building up of the heavenly City; and if we try to impose on the different Christian communities an

* Here I think the traditional Anglican position has been partly misunderstood. For the Caroline Divines, the Church of England consisted of two provinces separated from the rest of the Church; how could two provinces claim to be *the* Church ? And here, in the view of us Anglicans, lies our claim to Catholicity: precisely in the fact that we did not set up ourselves to be *the true Church*, as did the Donatists, the Calvinists, and our own Puritans, but only a part of the Church. We shall return to this point later.

enjoined uniformity, we will destroy much life and the expression of new aspects of the Christian faith." But the variety which will have to find place in this unity includes also, besides the liturgical usages belonging to Romans, Orthodox, Anglicans, Lutherans, Presbyterians, the Confessions proper to the particular Churches—for example, the Westminster Confession, the Augsburg Confession, the Formula Concordiæ. These Confessions evidently present "different aspects"; but to speak of different aspects is not to imply "that one is true and the other false"; rather "they are different interpretations of the one truth, and that clearly must remain." And again: "It will be useless and dangerous for us to build up any form of United Church, unless all alike, Romanist, Anglican, Protestant, Nonconformist, have learnt the fundamental doctrines of Christian liberty" (quoted from *Faith and Order*, the Proceedings of the Lausanne Conference, ed. H. N. Bate, English refs., pp. 334, 336, 341).

On the last sentence, Fr. Congar comments: "This is to introduce a new and obligatory uniformity, that of a common acceptance of Liberalism." His summing-up of the whole section is best represented by these words: "We say it in all respect and with all sympathy: this œcumenical ideal is not to be taken seriously. It does not do justice either to Unity and its demands, or to our divisions and their real implications. . . . The order of thought appears to be one that is ideologically false. The true order is to say: 'Here is the true nature of unity, and these are its demands; let us then set ourselves to see the diversity gathered within the unity.' The false order, followed here, is to say: 'There exist the national Churches and the various Confessions; what should be the unity which will contain them, and what will be their relations to one another within that unity?' As if, in face of our divisions, it were not necessary to inquire into their nature, and whether their existence is normal, and whether the national Churches and the different Confessions are not, in some respects at least, in a state of what has always been called schism and heresy. We cannot take seriously such a purely pragmatic conception of the Church. . . . We think that it does not deal sufficiently seriously with the meaning either of unity of faith, or of the demands of catholic community, or of the interior and the exterior unity of the People of God, which is the Church" (pp. 225-7).

III

So far we have been summarizing Fr. Congar. Some comments and reflections are evidently called for; but since this is the end of an article and not the beginning of a treatise, they must be brief.

The discussion which has been summarized in the last few pages is closely related to the idea of Catholicity. We think that there is a distinction to be made here, to which Fr. Congar does not do justice. We have said above (p. 18, note) that the old Anglicans had a very sound notion of Catholicity. He quotes on p. 222, from *The King's Book*, 1543, the following passage: " This unity of the holy Church of Christ is not divided by distance of place nor by diversity of traditions and ceremonies, diversely observed in divers churches, for good order of the same. For the Church of Corinth and of Ephese were one Church in God, though the one were far distant in place from the other; and though also in traditions, opinions, and policies there was some diversity among them, likewise as the Church of England, Spain, Italy and Poole be not separate from the unity but be one Church in God. . . ." Surely he would agree that this is an admirable expression of Catholicity—if no schism had taken place.

But when the schism has taken place, and has lasted for centuries and become stabilized, there is evidently a danger that a theory of the nature of the Church and its possible reunion will be elaborated, starting not from the New Testament teaching on the Unity of the mystical Body, but from the fact of the schism. The notion of Catholicity then turns into that of Comprehensiveness; it is the *Catholica* without the *Una*. Anglicans are found proposing an ideal of a reunited Church which would be in fact a federation of independent communities, a sort of ecclesiastical counterpart of the League of Nations—Fr. Congar drops this hint, p. 246—and, like it, resting on a common acceptance of the principles of Liberalism.

But such is not the Biblical doctrine of the Church. " The One Church is the union not of all local Churches, but of all their members (1 Cor. xii. 13, 27; Gal. iii. 27 f.; Eph. iv. 4). Baptism admits, not into a particular Church, but into union with Christ, and therefore into union with His Body, the universal Ecclesia " (H. B. Swete, *The Holy Catholic Church*, p. 12; quoted by Fr. Congar, p. 246). We said at the start that the entrance of the Roman Catholic Church into the œcumenical arena will certainly make a profound change in œcumenical discussions. Does it not signify this first, that we are recalled from the false notion of " Comprehensiveness,"

and from our Liberal Catholicism and from our Northern Catholicism, back to the true notion of Catholicity, back to the Biblical idea of the One mystical Body ?

Secondly it means that Romans and Anglicans can no longer think of themselves as two opposed armies, each bent on winning the victory over the other, according to the idea which has dominated our controversy down to Gore's *Roman Catholic Claims*, and since, but that we are separated *brethren* and that a door is now open for us to discuss things together with complete frankness. This has been a poor account of Fr. Congar's book if it has not shown him conducting exactly such a discussion.

Thirdly, if we on our side are prepared to make and to mean the central admission that Rome is *somehow* the visible centre of the Church's unity, *that does not by itself solve a single one of the differences actually existing between us*. We Anglicans must bring forward and formulate all the difficulties that we feel; only now it will be, not in order to win a controversial victory, but in what St. Augustine calls *litem concordem, litem caritatis* (see p. 14 above). We do in fact feel most of the difficulties about Rome that, as we have seen, Fr. Congar says we feel (see pp. 12, 13 above). There is a serious danger lest the joy of new-found friendship should lead to a false simplification of the issue.

Theologically, the theme of the whole controversy (or discussion) would appear to be one, under many different forms—namely, the relation of the divine and the human elements in the mystical Body. The crucial question, how far the Church can go wrong, comes to a head in the problem of the Middle Ages and the Reformation. We think Fr. Congar does not estimate sufficiently seriously the disease of Christendom in the Middle Ages, the liturgical aspect of which is brought out so vividly in Fr. Gregory Dix's essay in *The Parish Communion*, so that he tends to pass over the abuses rather lightly, as if they were mere incidents due to human frailty. But does not the fact that the Roman Catholic Church lost out of her unity nearly all northern Europe show that men had lost sight of the truth of the unity of the mystical Body ? Protestants on their side believe that the Church system had become so secularized that it was only through schism that their forefathers could find room to live and breathe; that the Reformation was a demand for freedom, not in the false modern sense of freedom to do what one likes, but in the sense of freedom to live as Christians; and that this freedom could not then be found within the Church. Are they wholly wrong ? Similarly, it is against the background of the disease of

Christendom in the Middle Ages that we are to see the true meaning of Anglicanism; and we can rightly claim that it at least desired to go to the right place to find the remedy—to the Scriptures, illuminating the faith and the sacraments and hierarchical order of the Church. And this remains true, however much the Church of England has suffered from the schism.

Other aspects of this same question of the divine and human elements in the Church of God come out with regard to the teaching office of the Church; to what extent can priest, bishop, pope, teach wrong? "We have this treasure in earthen vessels," said the Apostle; what is the relation of the Truth itself, as it is in God, to the appointed witness to the Truth? And again, in the question of the appeal to Scripture as the canon or standard of the Tradition of the Church: since the New Testament may be described, broadly, as the Apostolic testimony to the redemption once effected, in history, by the saving work of Christ, there is the pressing problem of the relation of the private judgment of the independent historical investigator to the Church's authoritative teaching about these things. This is a crude and halting statement; but some such statement was necessary if we are to face the problem squarely.

And yet, on nearly all these questions Fr. Congar's book can throw some light, and, above all, it gives the vision of the *Una Catholica* in which all Christians must at last find their home. We had best conclude with the closing words of this great book, "*Ædificans Jerusalem* DOMINUS, *dispersiones Israelis* CONGREGABIT" (Ps. cxlvii. 2), and with the needed warning against any attempt "to imagine or to foresee what this reunion in its concrete shape will be" (p. 309). God will bring reunion about in His own time. If it is His work, it will none the less be done through human agents. Those human agents must beware lest they stand in the way of what He is doing. For it is His work. As Fr. Couturier has put it,* in praying for reunion "we are asking for a miracle." But why not? "Whoso shall say to this mountain . . ."

A. G. HEBERT, S.S.M.

THE EXCEPTING CLAUSE IN ST. MATTHEW

THE problem propounded by the Pharisees in St. Matt. xix. 3—"Is it lawful for a man to put away his wife for every cause?"—must be illustrated from contemporary facts and theories.

* See *Œcumenica*, April, 1937, p. 452.

First, the phrase occurs in Josephus: "He that desires to be divorced from his wife for any cause whatsoever (and many such causes happen among men)".* Secondly, the Mishnah relates that "The school of Shammai say: a man may not divorce his wife unless he has found unchastity in her. . . . And the School of Hillel say he may divorce her even if she find no favour in his eyes."† Thirdly, "the case of Herodias, who had actually left her husband, was still present to the minds of the Jews, and it was a dangerous thing for anyone too openly to express his opinion of wives who left their husbands, in view of the way in which Herodias had acted, and of the other matrimonial complications for which the House of Herod was notorious. Interference in this matter seems to have cost John the Baptist his life, and the Pharisees no doubt hoped to entangle Jesus in the same difficulties by eliciting from Him an uncompromising statement on the question of marriage and divorce."‡

Our Lord replied to the Pharisees' question by referring them to Genesis and the original law at Creation; insisting on the fact that man and wife "are no more twain but one flesh"; drawing the conclusion: "What therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder." When the Pharisees attempted to neutralize this conclusion by appealing to the permission of divorce in Deuteronomy, our Lord replied that this was a concession to the hardness of the Jewish heart, and contrary to what was designed from the beginning. Then follows the arresting sentence: "And I say unto you, Whosoever shall put away his wife, except it be for fornication, and shall marry another, committeth adultery; and whoso marrieth her which is put away doth commit adultery."

I

Four different interpretations have been placed upon the excepting clause:

1. First that the reference is to unchastity on the woman's part before she was married. This interpretation was held by the historian Döllinger. He maintained that the technical term applied in the passage (*porneia*) was always applied to the sin of an unmarried person, and not to unfaithfulness in a wife. Deception in so essential a matter invalidated the marriage.

This interpretation does not seem to have secured many supporters. Joyce says that "the Church has never regarded

* *Antiq.* IV. viii. 23. † Gittin, ix. 10; Danby transl., p. 321.
‡ Kirsopp Lake in *Expositor*, 1910, p. 420.

it as lawful for a man to repudiate his wife if he should discover that previously to her marriage she had been guilty of immorality. Had Christ really so taught, it is inconceivable that the Church should have been completely ignorant of it."*

Bishop Creighton says that this interpretation " will not do. Such a man as the Bishop of Lincoln is against it on patristic grounds. It is untenable."†

2. A second interpretation is that the excepting clause refers to marriage within the prohibited degrees. It was a case of nullity. The indissolubility of a valid marriage remains unaffected. The rule is invariable that what God has joined together man may not sever. God only joins those who consent to the essential conditions. This is why St. Mark, in a narrative designed for Gentile converts, omits the exceptional case, since it only concerned the Jews, and did not affect the general fact that marriage cannot be dissolved.

This interpretation of the excepting clause has been recently maintained by Dr. Lowther Clarke.‡ He calls attention to the fact that the technical term employed in the exceptive clause is the same as is employed in the Apostolic Decree in Acts xv. 29. That Decree regulates four different practices of which the first three are concerned with matters repulsive to Jews but innocent enough to Gentiles. It is natural to think that the fourth practice is of a similar character. This would be the case if the last of the four practices referred to marriage within the prohibited degrees: for that would be repulsive to a Jew but indifferent to a Gentile, who was not concerned with the legal regulations of Israel. The reference is to a case where no true marriage had ever taken place; that is, to a case of nullity. With this explanation Dr. Selwyn agrees: " In the case covered by the exception the marriage was not dissoluble, but *null*."§ Dr. Gavin of New York supports this explanation on the ground of rabbinical evidence.‖ He considers that Acts quite definitely and St. Paul in 1 Cor. v. certainly have in view specific rabbinic usage, in which case " the alleged Matthæan exception contains no substantial departure on the point of Dominical marriage legislation from the Synoptic traditions as stated in St. Mark x. 2 and St. Luke xvi. 18." If this interpretation is accepted, there is no contradiction between St. Matthew and the other New Testament authorities.

3. A third interpretation is that the clause implies that unchastity dissolves the marriage bond, and leaves the partners

* *Christian Marriage*, p. 286.
† *Life of M. Creighton*, ii. 68.
‡ THEOLOGY, 1927, p. 162.
§ THEOLOGY, 1927, p. 163.
‖ THEOLOGY, 1928, pp. 104-5.

free to contract another union. That is to say that marriage is *ipso facto* dissolved by unfaithfulness on either side.

On this interpretation the historian Döllinger remarked: "To support this interpretation, the theory has been devised that adultery destroys the essence of marriage, . . . so that the formal divorce and subsequent marriage is the mere authentication and rightful consequence of an accomplished fact."*

The theory that an act of adultery *ipso facto* cancels marriage has been modified of late. The scholars and theologians who replied to the Bishop of Chichester's questions are summarized as maintaining that "the exceptional clause is not dealing with one or two, so to speak, casual acts of adultery: it applies only to unfaithfulness persisted in to a point where it has become a virtual renunciation of the original marriage."†

This, however, raises the very serious question whether it is within the power of the husband and wife to cancel the marriage bond. The New Commentary reflects that "the view that adultery dissolves the marriage bond not only degrades the conception of marriage by making its physical side the dominant consideration," it also involves that "a man may cease to be married and yet be unaware of the fact."‡

When the scholars and theologians whom the Bishop of Chichester consulted distinguished between a single act of unfaithfulness in marriage and habitual and persistent unfaithfulness, they clearly abandoned the idea that marriage is *ipso facto* destroyed by unfaithfulness. But they by no means solve the question whether obligation is cancelled by refusal to fulfil it.

The Bishop of Gloucester maintains that the teaching of the New Testament on the subject of Divorce "is based on the Christian ideal of marriage. The Christian ideal is that a man and woman become one in body and in spirit. They are closely united as father and son, or brother and sister. No misconduct on the part of the son ever removes the duty and obligation of the father, no misconduct of husband or wife takes away from the duty or obligation of marriage."§

There is the further consideration that according to Christian principles there are three persons concerned in a marriage—the man, the woman and God. The entrance into the married state requires the consent of the man and of the woman. But the state into which they enter is the creation of God, and can

* *First Age of the Church*, E.T., ii. 262.
† Appendix, Report to Convocation, p. 67.
‡ Levertoff and Goudge, p. 174. § Bishop of Gloucester, *C.Q.R.*, 1921, p. 225.

only rightly be entered into in accordance with the intentions of its Creator, and the essential nature of that state. And in the Christian doctrine that state is lifelong, and cannot be dissolved. This involves the profoundly religious view that it is not in human power to cancel a relation which the Almighty has created.

4. A fourth interpretation of the excepting clause is that in case of unchastity separation is permissible, but divorce is not, since marriage cannot be dissolved. This is the traditional interpretation.

II

The relation of St. Matthew's excepting clause to the other New Testament authorities is a very weighty matter in estimating the value of that clause. The entire absence of any such exception in the three separate authorities—St. Mark, St. Luke and St. Paul—is from any point of view impressive.

St. Mark,* recording the same incident as St. Matthew, represents our Lord as saying: "Whosoever shall put away his wife and marry another committeth adultery against her. And if a wife shall put away her husband, and be married to another, she committeth adultery." Thus the earliest of the Gospels shows no trace whatever of any exception.

St. Luke is no more aware than St. Mark of any exception to the indissoluble character of marriage among the followers of our Lord.†

St. Paul draws a clear distinction between rules which rest only on Apostolic authority and the commands of Christ: "And unto the married I command, yet not I, but the Lord, let not the wife depart from her husband: But and if she depart, let her remain unmarried, or be reconciled to her husband: and let not the husband put away his wife."‡ This "reproduces in effect the teaching of our Lord, though not in the exact words."§ In the case of mixed marriages, if the pagan partner is willing to continue to live with the Christian, the married are not to separate. But what if the pagan refuses to live with his converted wife after she has abandoned her ancestral paganism? "If the unbelieving depart, let him depart."‖ The deserted partner is free in such a case. "But nothing is said as to whether she is free to marry again or not. . . . Nothing is said to suggest it, and to give such advice would have been quite contrary to all St. Paul's principles."¶

Dr. Selwyn argues that "St. Paul lays down the principle, and says that it was expressly ordained by Christ, that the

* x. 11-12. † Luke xvi. 18. ‡ 1 Cor. vii. 10-11. § *C.Q.R.*, 1921, p. 223.
‖ 1 Cor. vii. 15. ¶ Dr. Headlam, *C.Q.R.*, 1921, p. 224.

marriage of Christians is indissoluble: so that a Christian wife, for instance, who leaves her husband must either remain unmarried, or else be reconciled to him. St. Paul, that is to say, forbids divorce among Christians absolutely."*

Sexual problems confronted St. Paul at Corinth. "In such an atmosphere there must have been frequent cases where the excepting clause, if any authority could have been found for it in Christ's teaching, would have seemed to provide an obvious solution for difficulties. Yet St. Paul recognizes neither divorce nor remarriage."†

Even in a case of mixed marriage St. Paul "does not suggest that the marriage contract is annulled, nor that the Christian partner may marry again."

The impression made by St. Paul's teaching on marriage is summarized by Dr. Kirk: "Both Jewish and Roman custom allowed a wife who (by whatever legal means and for whatever cause) was divorced from her husband complete liberty of remarriage. St. Paul introduces his startling innovation without the slightest apparent recognition of its revolutionary character. He quotes it as a word of the Lord which will be accepted as such without challenge. Both these facts go far to prove that long before the Synoptic tradition had been reduced to its present form, and within twenty-five years of the Crucifixion itself, there was absolute unanimity in the Church that our Lord had proclaimed the indissolubility of marriage. These facts are of the greatest importance. Apostolic Christianity set itself to revolutionize the temper of existing society."‡

III

We have to bear in mind the difficulties which the excepting clause creates in the minds of many scholars and theologians of the present century. It would imply that our Lord sided with Shammai against Hillel. Moore, in his great work on Judaism, says that the excepting clause "is verbatim Shammai's formulation: matter of unchastity."§

Dr. Selwyn urges that "the whole purpose of our Lord's appeal from Deuteronomy to Genesis, from the letter of the Law which allowed divorce to the spirit of the Law which was expressed at the Creation, is stultified if at the end of it He simply returns to Deuteronomy again."‖

Then further, many readers of St. Matthew feel that the impression which our Lord's instruction on marriage made

* THEOLOGY, August, 1927, p. 92.
† THEOLOGY, August, 1927, p. 100.
‡ Kirk, *Marriage and Divorce*, p. 93.
§ Moore, *Judaism*, ii. 124.
‖ THEOLOGY, 1927, p. 95.

on His disciples shows that they understood that for a Christian it could not be dissolved.

" His own disciples were so impressed by the unhappy case a man might find himself in if marriage was to be an indissoluble bond that they felt it would be safer not to marry at all."*

They must have been profoundly astonished and disconcerted to say that. Is not the comment of the disciples proof that they understood our Lord to teach a standard of marriage immeasurably higher and more exacting than that which their strictest Jewish instructors maintained ?

What then is to be made of the excepting clause ? The thirty-four scholars and theologians—German and English—consulted by the Bishop of Chichester, whose evidence is summarized in the Appendix to the Report to Convocation, record their " almost unanimous opinion " that " the exceptional clause in St. Matt. v. 32 and xix. 9 is in neither place part of the original teaching of our Lord."†

" It is much more likely," says Professor Paterson of Edinburgh, " that a hard saying of Jesus was toned down in the oral tradition, or by the Evangelist, than that, if the exception was originally mentioned, it was allowed to drop out of an authoritative history."‡

Professor Kirsopp Lake says that " the conditional clause in Matthew does not represent a genuine saying of Christ; it was introduced in consequence of the practical difficulty which arose when it was perceived that the prohibition of divorce sometimes conflicted with the duty of Christians of avoiding the company of immoral persons, and it was not intended to convey any permission to remarry."§

In reference to the occurrence of this clause in St. Matt. v. 32, the Bishop of Gloucester asks: " Now where would have been the superiority of the Christian morality if you keep the passage in the form in which St. Matthew gives it ? Our Lord says our righteousness is to exceed the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees, and then He is represented as saying that a man should not divorce his wife save for the cause of unchastity. But that was exactly the teaching of one party of the Pharisees themselves. Where then would the superiority of Christian teaching have come in ?" Accordingly Dr. Headlam concludes that the passage in St. Matt. v. 32 " must originally have been in the form in which you get it in St. Luke "—that is to say, without any exceptive clause.|| That clause is therefore regarded as " a quite natural relaxation of the rule during the early Jewish Church, conforming itself to the standard of life

* Moore, *Judaism*, ii. 125. † Pp. 67-68. ‡ *Expositor*, October, 1910.
§ Kirsopp Lake, *Expositor*, 1910, p. 427. || *C.Q.R.*, 1921, p. 221.

around it." "The early Jewish Christians found our Lord's command too hard. They were prepared to allow some relaxation."*

It may be worth while to add the criticism of a great Roman Catholic layman whose influence over English Churchmen has been immense. Von Hügel declared it as one of the few quite certain eliminations of criticism that "our Lord never made that strange limitation to His condemnation of divorce."†

It deserves notice that the critics who set aside the excepting clause are of widely different schools of thought, and attached to different Christian communions.

IV

The general attitude of the Primitive Church toward St. Matthew's excepting clause was to ignore it. It is an undisputed fact that Christians of the first three centuries practically followed the teaching of St. Mark, St. Luke and St. Paul, and ignored the excepting clauses in St. Matthew. It is well to have an illustration of this fact. Both for its clearness and its early date, (about 140) the Shepherd of Hermas is very memorable. Hermas enquires of the Shepherd, who is his spiritual director, "What then, Sir, is the husband to do, if his wife continue in her vicious practices?" He replied: "The husband should put her away, and remain by himself. But if he put his wife away and marry another, he also commits adultery." Hermas then asks: "What if the woman put away should repent and wish to return to her husband: shall she not be taken back by her husband?" The Shepherd replied: "Assuredly. If the husband do not take her back, he sins, and brings a great sin upon himself: for he ought to take back the sinner who has repented." And the Shepherd explains that the separated ought not to marry again, so that the guilty may have the opportunity to repent. Moreover, if the man does remarry he commits adultery.

A collection of the Ante-Nicene interpretations of our Lord's teaching concerning divorce is given by Dr. Arendzen in the *Journal of Theological Studies* for 1919, pp. 230-41. Dr. Arendzen's conclusion is that "Before Nicæa there is no evidence that the Christian Church interpreted the excepting clause as authorizing the breaking of the marriage bond itself, in the sense that the partners ceased to be husband and wife, and that at least the innocent party might remarry. All the evidence there is, and it is considerable, points the other way."‡

* *C.Q.R.*, 1921, p. 221.
† *Selected Letters*, ed. B. Holland, p. 158.
‡ Page 241.

If it is asked why did not Christians in the first three centuries draw any inference in favour of remarriage from the excepting clause in St. Matt. xix. 9, the answer seems to be that, unless they regarded it as a case of nullity, they understood our Lord to allow separation, but not divorce. In this way they harmonized St. Matthew with St. Mark, and, as the Shepherd of Hermas says, left open the room for repentance and reconciliation.

V

It is sometimes argued that since the Church has accepted the Gospel of St. Matthew as one of the Canonical Gospels, an ordinary Christian has an equitable right to do that which that Gospel represents our Lord as having declared to be right, or permissible—even if the Gospel was wrong in so representing Him. But that contention is untenable.

1. When the Church pronounces a book to be Canonical, what does that pronouncement involve? Does it guarantee the accuracy of every particular report that it contains? Or does it only certify the contents as a general guide for Christian faith and conduct? When the Books of the Old Testament are pronounced Canonical, does it mean more than this latter? Latin theologians tend to give far more attention to canonizing a person than to canonizing a book. However, the *Catholic Encyclopædia*,* speaking of a collection of writings as definitely canonized, explains canonizing to mean "adjudged to have a uniquely Divine and authoritative quality." But what precisely it is in which that quality consists is another question. Franzelin† says that God is the author of the Scriptures, yet the human writer is in his own degree, in will and work, the author of the same.

2. Moreover, that we cannot infer from the Church's canonization of St. Matthew's Gospel that the ordinary Christian has a right to divorce and remarry in case of a partner's unfaithfulness on the ground of the exceptive clause in that Evangelist seems conclusively plain from the fact that the Church itself has in its practice ignored that exception. Oscar Watkins says that the first three Christian centuries afford no single instance of a writer who approves remarriage during the lifetime of a separated partner; while there are repeated and most decided assertions of the principle that such marriages are unlawful. And further, speaking generally, the period from Constantine to Justinian shews the Western Churches maintaining the entire indissolubility of Christian marriage, while the Churches of the East give an uncertain sound.

* *S.v.* Canon, p. 27.

† *De Trad.*, p. 334.

Loisy's opinion, as an independent critic, is of interest. "The Catholic Church, in refusing to allow any case of divorce, has maintained the principle established by Jesus, and it matters little that it could not do so without sacrificing the historic sense of the passages in which St. Matthew treats the subject. It could not be otherwise in a period when men did not conceive that one Evangelist could express less faithfully than another the thought of Christ."*

It is of course well known that the ancient Churches of the East have allowed divorce and remarriage in a number of cases, beyond anything for which our Lord's authority could be claimed, even if the exceptive clause were regarded as a genuine expression of His teaching. But it has to be remembered that no Church in the world has been so completely under secular dominion, largely indeed under Mohammedan dominion, subjected to rulers whose treatment of their Christian population rendered strict adherence to a higher doctrine of marriage excessively difficult, if not perilous. The sufferings which the Eastern Church has endured from adherents of other religions awakens the deepest sympathy, but does not render their relaxations of the laws of marriage an example for our imitation.

3. Moreover, the individual Christian must, in his action on an isolated text, be guided by the interpretation which the local Church in its rules and Canons has placed upon it. A Lutheran might claim freedom to act upon the excepting clause on the ground that divorce was sanctioned by the Constitutions of his Church. No member of the Roman Church would be free to do this, in face of the Canon Law that "the bond of matrimony cannot be dissolved on account of the adultery of one of the married parties, and that both, or even the innocent one who gave no occasion to the adultery, cannot contract another marriage during the lifetime of the other." Neither can any member of the English Church be free to divorce and remarry while their partner lives; for that is just as clearly against the Canon Law of the English Church as it is against the Canon Law of the West.†

* Loisy, *Les Evangiles Synoptique*, i. 580.

† Canon 07 of 604.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF ST. MARK*

"Search the Scriptures; for in them ye think ye have eternal life; and they are they which testify of Me" (St. John v. 39).

When I last spoke in this chapel I drew attention to the profound significance of the presence in every Oxford college of a building consecrated to the worship of God.† Our founders intended that the spirit of religion should hallow the labours of both teachers and taught. The chapel was not intended to provide a select body of pious men with the means of obtaining by prayer and sacrament the spiritual sustenance which they required for their individual lives, but rather to be a place where men of every kind, united in devotion to a common tradition, should meet to thank God for His goodness and to dedicate themselves to His service. I ventured to suggest that all who consider that our college activities would lose much if they were dissociated from worship might well shew by their presence at the chapel services that they believe religion to be at least one of the elements which constitute college loyalty.

Valuable as this point of view may be, it has very definite limitations. Anyone who has studied the religion of ancient Greece and Rome will agree that the cults of the city-states, in which all good citizens were expected to take part, did little more than stimulate a rather narrow patriotism. Their appeal was limited to a definite group of people, and their fate was dependent on that of the city with whose institutions they were connected. Even Judaism suffered from this defect. The Temple was the symbol of the unity of the Chosen People, and any Gentiles who might be attracted by the noble teaching of the Psalms and the Prophets were repelled by its close association with a particular nation and with a code of laws which was framed to suit the peculiar character and temperament of the Jewish people.

The reason why today Christianity is fighting for its life in countries where nationalism has been raised to the level of a religion is clear enough. In its essence, as the early Church was quick to recognize, our religion makes an appeal which transcends all national or racial boundaries. "There is neither Greek nor Jew, circumcision nor uncircumcision, Barbarian, Scythian, bond nor free: but Christ is all and in all." "The hour cometh when ye shall neither in this mountain nor yet in

* An Address delivered in the Chapel of University College, Oxford, on St. Mark's Day, April 25, 1937, by G. H. Stevenson, Fellow and Senior Tutor.

† Theology, March, 1936, p. 161.

Jerusalem worship the Father." The Christian religion, though it may adapt the form of its message to particular conditions, is fundamentally independent of national, social or economic differences. It offers a solution of the problem of life which is one and the same for all mankind.

These considerations make it clear that there is a certain danger in associating religion too closely with institutions other than the Church itself. In an age of rapid change it is not safe to regard religion as a picturesque adjunct to organizations which it may become necessary to modify profoundly or even to abolish. It is, of course, inevitable that the Church should associate herself with such institutions as the British Monarchy, of whose character and objects she approves, but this association should not be too close. Much of the toleration which religion enjoys in this country at the present day rests on little more than sentimental association with things which for quite other reasons make an appeal. It has been well said that "the feeling that Christian doctrines are lightly held or are being whittled down to a woolly humanitarianism has emptied many churches and spread scepticism among a people not naturally sceptical. Our national religion is today being largely driven out of doors and finds expression in singing hymns at football-matches and in the enjoyment of civic ceremonial and military pageants." If there is any truth in these words it would be wrong to regard with complacency the spiritual condition of the English people.

When we compare Christianity with the pagan religions of antiquity we must note not only the universality of its appeal but also its close connection with definite historical events. Our religion is not merely a system of ritual resting on a mythology, the truth or falsehood of which is a matter of no special importance. We pay divine honour to a Figure who lived at a definite date, whose doings and sayings are recorded in historical documents which were from the second century regarded as authoritative, and which all branches of the Church still consider to be the ultimate source of their teaching. It is surely the duty of those of us who value religion and who may be called upon to defend the faith against attack to equip ourselves for this task by acquiring the necessary knowledge of these documents. Vague goodwill and punctual performance of religious duties are not enough. Christianity is as definite a philosophy of life as Platonism, or Aristotelianism, and deserves to be studied with the same care. There are today rival philosophies, the merits of which are set forth very persuasively. "If," as the Archbishop of York has said, "ordinary members of the Christian Church become inarticulate

whenever searching questions are raised in their presence, the suggestion is inevitably strong that there is no very forcible case to be made for the Christian interpretation of life and that the whole weight of reason lies upon another side than this."

The suggestion that we should make it our duty to familiarize ourselves with the documents on which the whole structure of Christian theology has been based is one that may suitably be made today, when the Church bears in mind the debt which she owes to the Evangelist St. Mark. In recent times historical critics have drawn the attention of readers of the Bible to the very great importance of the Gospel of St. Mark as the main source of our knowledge of Our Lord's life on earth. Professor C. H. Turner has said: "It is the unique record, objectively stated, of the experience of an eye-witness, an intimate companion of Jesus throughout His ministry. Is it then paradoxical to say that it is the most important book ever written?" Scholars are practically agreed that the Gospel as we have it was written not much more than thirty years after the death of Christ, and many think that the author's main source of information was St. Peter himself. It is commonly supposed that Mark himself was the unnamed young man who cast his garment away and fled from the Garden of Gethsemane. In any case he and his mother lived in a house in Jerusalem which was frequented by the apostles, and to which Peter went on his deliverance from prison. Mark accompanied St. Paul on one of his missionary journeys and was related to St. Barnabas. Later on he was closely connected with St. Peter, with whom he lived in Rome, and who refers to him as "Marcus my son." He seems thus to have spent his whole life in Christian circles, and to have had access to absolutely first-hand material. After the death of St. Peter in the Neronian persecution he decided to commit to writing the authentic information which he had received for the benefit of the Christian societies which were springing up all through the Mediterranean world.

Even if we knew nothing of the circumstances of St. Mark's life it would be clear to every reader of his gospel that he derived much of his information from an eye-witness. It is full of vivid touches, not all of which are reproduced by the other evangelists. Perhaps the most striking feature of his narrative is the honesty with which the character of the apostles themselves is treated. No attempt is made to idealize them. The evangelist does not conceal the fact that they were often puzzled by the sayings of Our Lord. It is from St. Mark that we learn that St. Peter thrice denied his apostleship, that he fell asleep in the Garden of Gethsemane, and that Christ rebuked

him, saying, " Get thee behind Me, Satan, for thou savourest not the things which be of God." The apostles are represented as simple and limited men, who were often slow to appreciate the significance of the sayings of their Master.

Though St. Mark lays more stress on the failings of the apostles and on the humanity of Our Lord than the other evangelists, he does not provide any support for the view once popular with Liberal Protestants that the so-called " Historical Jesus " was primarily an ethical teacher. It is not in his gospel that we find the Sermon on the Mount, which some have taken to contain the essence of the teaching of Christ. He devotes far less space to ethical reflections than to narratives of miracles and to eschatological passages, which were as puzzling to the apostles as they are to us. The expectation of the early Church of a Second Coming in the near future was derived from the words of St. Mark: " There be some of them that stand here which shall not taste of death till they have seen the kingdom of God come with power." " This generation shall not pass till all these things be done." Our Lord said to the High Priest, " Ye shall see the Son of Man sitting on the right hand of power and coming in the clouds of heaven."

If we read St. Mark's gospel with an open mind we cannot, I think, fail to find it a rather puzzling book. It is quite clear, as I have said, that many of Our Lord's sayings were over the heads of the apostles, and that even thirty years after the crucifixion their meaning was still obscure. Valuable as St. Mark may be in providing the raw material, so to speak, out of which the theology of the Church was constructed, it would be a mistake to suppose that because of his early date he interpreted the mind of Christ more adequately than St. Paul or the author of the Fourth Gospel, who between them may be said to have founded Christian theology. The full significance of historical events is seldom clear to contemporaries, and it is easier to fit them into their proper context if they are viewed from a distance.

There can be no doubt that Our Lord Himself was aware that during His life on earth His disciples were not yet qualified to understand the full meaning of His message. Though little is said in the Synoptic gospels of the promised gift of the Holy Spirit, it is clear that the events of the Day of Pentecost were not unexpected. The great passages in St. John's gospel must surely be based on words of Christ Himself, of which the earlier evangelists had failed to see the full importance. " It is expedient for you that I go away; for if I go not away the Comforter will not come unto you." " I have many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now. Howbeit, when

He the Spirit of Truth is come, He will guide you into all truth."

It is from this point of view that I would ask you to consider St. Mark's gospel. It was an honest attempt to put on record the impression made by the enigmatic personality of Our Lord on the simple men who accompanied Him during the last few weeks of His life on earth, and who were selected by Him to form the nucleus of the Christian Church. As such it makes an invaluable contribution to our knowledge of Christ's teaching, and nothing can be accepted as essential to Christian doctrine which is inconsistent with its narrative. But it does not follow from this that St. Mark fully realized all that was implied by his words. If he is, as early Christian writers said, the interpreter of St. Peter, he himself stands in need of an interpreter.

It must never be forgotten that the familiar words which I have taken as my text refer to the Jewish and not to the Christian scriptures, and that the lesson which they teach is that the life of Christ should be studied in its historical context. The other evangelists lay more stress on the Old Testament prophecies of the coming of Christ than is done by St. Mark, who was writing primarily for non-Jewish readers. It is needless to say that the main object of the historical study of the New Testament, as it has developed during the last century, has been to provide the gospel narratives with their proper background. The days are long past when such a treatment of them could be regarded as in any way derogatory, or as inconsistent with their claim to divine inspiration.

Before closing I should like to emphasize two considerations which arise from what I have said. First, it is not possible for educated men to defend the Christian faith against its opponents without some knowledge of the interpretations which theologians from St. Paul and St. John onwards have put upon the narratives of the Synoptic gospels. These documents are not easy to interpret, and it is absurd to assert that the " simple gospel story " has been obscured by the work of theologians. The object of religious thinking is to render intelligible the great and fruitful ideas which are only implicit in the words of Christ, as they were recorded by His simple and unlearned followers. To do so adequately calls for qualifications at least as high as those which are required for the interpretation of Plato, and I appeal to you not to pay undue attention to apologists or critics of Christianity who do not possess the necessary equipment.

The other point which our consideration of St. Mark suggests to me is this. Even at a time when the words of

Christ were fresh in the memory of the early Church they were recorded rather differently by the writers of the gospels. Even the first three evangelists do not always lay stress on the same points, and the writer of the Fourth Gospel has a standpoint of his own. The interpretation which any man gives to the words of Christ is bound to be coloured by his character and his experience. I have spoken of Christianity as a philosophy of life, and emphasized the importance of theological study; but it must be remembered that after twenty centuries theologians are not yet unanimous, and that even now things which are hid from the wise and prudent may be revealed unto babes. What unites Christians is not intellectual agreement, but the sharing of a common faith in the divine order which Christ has revealed, and common membership in the Church, which throughout the centuries has borne witness to the value of the ideas first set forth in the gospels. Christians come nearest to Our Lord and to each other not when they meet at conferences or listen to discussions of the Atonement or the Incarnation, but when, learned or ignorant, rich or poor, they kneel together at the altar rails. At that moment controversies are forgotten, and all feel that they are one in upholding a great tradition, the full significance of which it is beyond the power of human language to express.

G. H. Stevenson.

THE EPIPHANY AND CERTAIN RADIANT POETS

"O God, whose only begotten Son appeared in the substance of our flesh, grant us, we beseech Thee, that through Him whom outwardly we recognize as akin to ourselves, we may have the grace to be inwardly re-made in His likeness."—*Ancient Latin Office for Octave of the Epiphany.*

"And afterwards, on the twelfth day, when the three kings came with their gifts and worshipped our Lord in His mother's lap, this creature, Our Lady's handmaid, *beholding all the process in contemplation*, wept full sore; and when she saw they would take their leave and go home she could not bear they should leave the presence of Our Lord."—*The Book of Margery Kempe.*

That strange, very human document, *The Book of Margery Kempe*, with its mixture of mysticism and an incongruous hysteria, speaks thus of the effect of the Epiphany on an imaginative and emotional nature. And a sequence of poets

has, like Margery, "beheld all the process in contemplation." The effect, however, upon them has been strikingly different. There is little that is tearful in their choral songs. Rather are they wisely disposed to "rejoice with exceeding great joy."

The Magi were a sacred caste of the Medes, and Tertullian says: "No Father of the Church holds the Magi to have been kings. The religion of the Magi forbade sorcery, their astrology and skill in interpreting dreams were the occasion of their finding Christ." Rationalists coldly dismiss all versions of the lovely story as fiction. Poets and painters know better. The world would be poorer if the glorious Babe of Gentile da Fabiano had never played with the white beard of an aged monarch in glorious robes, or if Dutch Vander Veyden had never seen the kings kneeling in ecstasy as they gaze upward at a shining star, centred with the figure of the Babe Himself. Perfect faith alone could have guided the hand that created their marvellous shrine in Cologne Cathedral, wherein their actual bones are supposed to rest. It is interesting to note that in the legion of world-famous Epiphany pictures the Magi are always crowned, and the ox and ass look on placidly, as if the artists loved the gentle beasts too well to leave them out.

The Apocryphal Book of Seth alleges that the Magi were later baptized by St. Thomas and became missionaries. Let who will doubt, when it is so much happier to go with the poets to follow the brightest of all stars.

Many forget that the Epiphany was magnificently celebrated before Christmas Day became the zenith of the festival of the Nativity. It was a comprehensive commemoration, being held on what was traditionally the date of the baptism of Our Lord, and of His first miracle.

The antiphon proclaimed: "Today the church is joined to her celestial spouse, because in Jordan Christ doth wash her sins, the Magi hasten with gifts to the royal marriage feast, and the guests exult in water turned to wine."

At Vespers come the triumphant words: "We keep the Holy Day adorned with three miracles. Today a star led the Magi to the Crib, today water was made wine at the marriage, today in Jordan Christ willed to be baptized to save us."

The familiar Office hymn, dated A.D. 450, stresses the triple feast:

"The Lamb of God is manifest
Again in Jordan's water blest. . . ."

"Lo! sages of the East are gone
To where the star hath newly shone. . . ."

"Yet he that ruleth everything
Can change the nature of the spring
And gives at Cana this for sign,
The water reddens into wine."

The " Feast of the Star," formerly popular, might make a picturesque revival. " Three priests impersonate the Magi. From the roof of the nave an iron circle having seven tapers was let down. Then a curtain was drawn revealing the King of Bethlehem and offerings were given."

What is thought to be the last rosary in London made before the Reformation proves that, like the old masters, cunning English craftsmen felt the magic of the story. It is now at the Victoria and Albert Museum, with a saint portrayed on every bead, the large pendant showing a tiny skilful picture of the Epiphany. This beautiful thing was hidden away in a day of destruction—strange irony that a Puritan poet should choose that time to make his act of adoration in immortal vocal music.

It has been said before here, that Milton is unapproachable. He re-creates for us that night of wonders " when all the spangled host keep watch in squadrons bright." Can any invitation be more compelling, surer to set the soul on fire with love ? Can any word stir the heart to such depths ?

> " See how from far, upon the Eastern road,
> The star-led wizards haste with odours sweet.
> O run, prevent them with thy humble ode
> And lay it lowly at His blessed feet.
> Have thou the honour first thy Lord to greet
> And join thy voice with the celestial quire
> From out His secret altar touched with hallowed fire. . . ."
>
> " The far-beaming blaze of majesty."

Can a more perfect profession of sure faith in the divine truth of the Incarnation be found ? These few lines would suffice to keep the laurels of Milton fadeless.

It has been well said that " critics may come in vain to hear passionate Crashaw preach on the Nativity. He leads them to the Crèche and bows before it." That he " breaks his jar of ointment prodigally " at the feet of Jesus is nowhere more apparent than in his hymn sung in alternate verses by the three kings:

> " Bright Babe whose awful beauties make
> The morn incur a sweet mistake,
> For whom the officious Heavens devize
> To disinherit the sun's rise.
> Delicately to displace the day, and plant
> It fairer in Thy face. . . .
> Look up, sweet Babe, look up and see;
> For love of Thee
> Thus far from home
> The East is come
> To seek herself in those sweet eyes.
> O little All, in Thy embrace
> The world lies warm and likes her place."

The last is a restful thought, followed by a prayer pathetically appropriate for a day of difficulty: "Lift up our lean souls!" Often obscure and involved, prone to meticulous verbal embroideries, Crashaw came very near the hallowed spot where a fragrant legend would have us believe the hay turned into rosy blossoms—sainfoin in very deed.

It is a surprise not to find George Herbert conspicuous among the choristers of the Epiphany. Blake is another we might imagine haunted by its glamour. "The Vision of Joseph and Mary" does not give us a vision splendid with gold, frankincense and myrrh. Nor is Keble happy upon this inspiring theme—his use of such words as "progeny" and "grovelling" jar upon the ear. They are not for high poetic rapture, and his hymn is trite and commonplace:

> "What matter if in calm old age
> Our childhood's star again arise,
> Crowning our lonely pilgrimage
> With all that cheers a wanderer's eyes?"

He is in better mood in the prose of the preface to "Lyra Innocentium": "Let us then *brightly* give our very best to Our Lord." For how can the pilgrimage be lonely if it leads to Him?

To pause for a moment over hymns in constant use is to be startled by the antiquity of the joy-song of Prudentius, born in 348, and finding centuries later an ideal translator in Caswall:

> "Fairer than the star at morning
> Was the star that told his birth. . . .
> By its lambent beauty guided
> See the Eastern kings appear. . . .
> See them bend their gifts to offer,
> Gifts of incense, gold and myrrh."

Crystal clear glows the picture, yet a modern worshipper gives us almost the same radiant impression. The missionary Bishop Heber strikes a clarion note when he invokes the star itself:

> "Brightest and best of the sons of the morning,
> Dawn on our darkness and lend us thine aid,
> Star of the east the horizon adorning,
> Guide where our infant Redeemer is laid."

He wrote the hymn on what he called "India's coral strand." It is on fire with the fervour of his adoration as he asks ardently:

> "Say shall we yield him in costly devotion
> Odours of Edom and offerings divine?"

It is of the elect few hymns that go straight to the heart, and is therefore beyond criticism. J. B. Monsell's "O Worship

the Lord in the Beauty of Holiness," in the same metre, has something of plagiarism, though "gold of obedience" is a happy phrase. Nor is the Scottish paraphrase "The race that long in darkness pined" inspiring. There should have been room found in the "English Hymnal" for the passionate outpouring for Epiphany of that loving daughter of the English Church, Christina Rossetti, but perhaps it was thought too intimately personal:

> "Trembling before Thee, we fall down to adore Thee,
> Shamefaced and trembling, we lift our eyes to Thee.
> O first and with the last, we own our ruined past,
> Rebuild us in Thy glory—set us free
> From sin and sorrow to fall down and worship Thee.
> Full of pity view us, stretch thy sceptre to us,
> Bid us live that we may give ourselves to Thee.
> O faithful Lord and true,
> Stand up for us to do,
> Make us lovely, make us new. . . ."

The woman who renounced earthly love could only offer myrrh to her "Lord Babe," "for love means sacrifice." She never realized that her devotion brought forth everlasting flowers.

Pessimists mutter that our present poets are but idle singers of an empty day! They ignore the few, "the happy few," numbered among the wise who follow the star. Not for these the music of the first Gloria in Excelsis, the vision of chanting angels vouchsafed to the shepherds, most favoured of all men. Only the star to guide them across the arid desert of unbelief. Yet they can—and do—ride rejoicing on their quest, singing upon the way.

Yesterday G. K. Chesterton left a vacant place not soon to be filled. He was of those who find the lost treasure of simplicity at the Crib. A fourteenth century carol is hardly simpler than his Epiphany song:

> "The Christ-Child lay in Mary's lap,
> His hair was like a star.
> O stern and cunning are the kings,
> But here the true hearts are. . . .
> All the flowers looked up at Him
> And all the stars looked down."

Surely a pretty and tender fancy!

And yesterday James Elroy Flecker made his golden journey to a fairer Samarkand. It has been truly said: "Neither the real nor the spurious disease of pessimism is present in his verse." What wonder the romance of the supreme adventure thrilled him as it thrilled Emile Cammaërts, who leads us to a moonlit desert trysting-place in the blue night to meet three

kings " draped in gold and silver," and hear their tinkling camel bells. The spice-laden sandalwood breath of the East comes soft and scented through Flecker's " Masque of the Magi ":

> " Three kings have come to Bethlehem
> And a trailing star in front of them."

Mary, amazed, asks :

> " ' What would you in this little place,
> You three bright kings ?' "

They answer, glad and confident:

> " ' Mother, we tracked the trailing star
> Which brought us here from lands afar,
> And we would look on His dear face
> Round whom the seraphs fold their wings.' "

And Mary asks again:

> " ' Who are you three bright kings ?'
>
> " ' Caspar am I; the rocky north
> From storm and silence drave me forth
> Down to the blue and tideless sea.
> For I am a great battle-lord
> And love the horns of chivalry.
> And I have brought Thee splendid gold,
> The strong man's joy refined and cold.
> All hail Thou Prince of Galilee.' "

And then Balthazar, " Lord of Ind," speaks:

> " ' My children who are tall and wise
> Stand by a tree with sunken eyes
> And seem to meditate or pray.
> And these red drops of frankincense
> Betoken man's intelligence.
> Hail, Lord of Wisdom, Prince of Day.' "

Strangely beautiful are the words of Melchior:

> " ' I am the dark man Melchior,
> And I shall live but a little more,
> Since I am old and feebly move.
> My kingdom is a burnt-up land
> Half buried by the drifting sand,
> So hot Apollo shines above.
> What could I bring but simple myrrh,
> *White blossoms of the cordial fire?*
> Hail, Prince of souls and Lord of love.'
>
> " ' Who art Thou, little King of kings ?'
> His wondering Mother sings."

In " Joseph and Mary," when Mary tells how the angel Gabriel " a stranger came with feet of flame," Joseph sees the kings approaching " when snow lies quiet in the grass."

" A Miracle of Bethlehem," with its deep compassion for

suffering humanity, is yet another proof that Flecker, like Margery Kempe, " saw the whole process in contemplation." For the miracle of the Incarnation is the same yesterday, today and forever, and the modern poet is not disobedient to the vision.

The " dream child " of Alfred Noyes knew how

> " Softly through the darkness shone the star of gold,
> Softly over Bethlehem and o'er the little cradled King
> Whom the sages worshipped with their frankincense and gold."

W. B. Yeats mentions " the crowned Magi " among those in quest of " the secret rose." Indeed, these poets, one and all who follow, cannot do without the jewelled crowns to be laid down in homage.

Father Andrew, S.D.C., has one of the essentials for an Epiphany singer—a deep devotion. If his " Christmas Rhymes " do not aspire to the heights, he makes us well content with his sincerity and the unquestioning faith of the minstrels of the carols of old:

> " Jingle, jangle, star and spangle,
> Over the wilderness wide.
> Tall camels sway in the wilderness way
> With their spacious, spongy stride.
> And three kings with mystic things
> In search of a King who is King of kings
> Three stedfast spectres ride.
> Stars are shining, silver lining
> Leaves of the palm trees grey.
> If God should call, forsaking all,
> Man must take the wilderness way,
> And these must ride nor ever abide
> On a road so long through a world so wide
> To a Babe on a bed of hay."

In a very beautiful poem Father Andrew shews us the poor and sinful, bringing their all of myrrh trembling and shamefaced. He sorrows for them, yet his is that sorrow going hand in hand with sure hope.

The Bishop of Glasgow has singled out for its freshness a re-telling of the old, old story by a new singer, Miss Marion Lockhead:

> " So still it was on the quiet road
> Kings went to hail their King. . . .
> It may be that, a moment Earth
> Turned back to innocence,
> Woke, smiled and rested, free a space
> From dreams of violence,
> That for a little Heaven's peace
> Set seal on every sense."

It is indeed sweetly natural that women should hasten to bring their flowers and make the wilderness blossom with their roses. Miss Buckton, in that brief classic of modern pageantry,

"Eager Heart," makes the kings impressive central figures. Her king of the lonely heart is truly a son of today, whose longing too many share without his high courage for the quest delivering him from loneliness for evermore.

A mere glance at so great a subject cannot pretend to be in any way chronological or comprehensive, yet a pause may be forgiven over an Epiphany prose-poem hidden away in a fairy tale of the seventies. Critics predict a future full of recognition of the literary charm of the perfect work with which Mrs. Ewing made her modest appeal to the children to be welcomed by their parents. Her "Crackers for Christmas" should be printed as a tract for present Christmas times. For the dream of the old parson makes a living reality of the Epiphany. The one event of a life-time of faithful work has been a visit to Palestine long ago, and he returns there in sleep:

"It was a starry night—*the noblest and most majestic vision of the handiwork of God.*" He sees the glittering cavalcade and exclaims: "Ah, happy Magi, faithful to the dim reality vouchsafed to you. . . ." "Ah," he almost sobbed, "let me follow! On my knees let me follow into the house and see the Holy Child. In the eyes of how many babies I have seen mind and thought beyond their powers of communication every mother knows. But if at times with a sort of awe, one sees the immortal soul shining through the prison bars of helpless infancy, what, oh! what must it be to behold the Godhead veiled in flesh through the face of a little child."

The last word may fittingly be with the American poet Vandyck, though he also speaks here in prose:

"The vast stream of history, flowing down from the cradle of nations in the Orient, sweeps suddenly towards the cradle of Jesus. The past with all its venerable traditions, the scattered races of mankind, the philosophy of the ages, the honour, and power, and wealth of earthly kingdoms, come thronging dimly in the train of these mysterious visitors to do homage to an infant on its mother's heart.

"And when our world learns the lesson; when pride bows down to meekness, and experience does homage to innocence; when every child is reverenced as a royal heir of Heaven because it is a brother of the Christ-Child—then the Epiphany will come and a great light will lighten the nations."

It is always the *wise* men who follow the star—mysterious magnet. It is the same now as when a fourteenth-century carol sang of

> "Kingis three
> That blissful flower come to see."

Changeless and lovely, each Epiphany the vision dawns on our darkness and makes the sun rise in our hearts. Let us obey the imperative summons of the prophet Amos and "seek him that maketh the seven stars and Orion, and turneth the shadow of death into the morning, and maketh the day dark with night: that calleth for the waters of the sea, and poureth them out upon the face of the earth. The Lord is His name."

ROWLAND GREY.

MISCELLANEA

"THE MATTHEAN EXCEPTION"

If I understand the Rev. R. O. P. Taylor aright his interpretation, given in your last issue, of Matt. xix. 3-12 implies that none but virgins are capable of marriage; "previous intercourse would render the marriage void because the very act (of sex) makes two persons one organism and has such profound psychological effects that it overrides and supersedes all other social ties." He might have added that it also has profound physical effects, often including childbirth.

Surely this argument proves too much. I am not concerned to deny that extra-marital intercourse may set up an indelible relationship, but it is another thing to say that it is an exclusive relationship rendering the person unmarriageable to any other party. Such a theory, which requires the physical condition of virginity as a prerequisite of marriage, would make bastards of most of the children of patriarchs and kings in our Lord's "genealogy." Abraham was married to his wives, but not to Hagar; Jacob was not virgin when he married Rachel. The polygamous kings of Israel and Judah were married to their wives, but not to their concubines. This was imperfect marriage and a deviation from the true type which was from "the beginning"; nevertheless, it was marriage and the children of such marriages were "holy" in the sense that there was no question of their sacred status.

It is, I venture to think, a disastrous error to equate sex intercourse with marriage. Cohabitation is a use or operation of marriage and no marriage is complete without it. Nevertheless, it was a sound maxim of Roman law that *Nuptias non concubitus sed consensus facit.* The mutual consent is a promise to live together in the married state with all the rights and obligations of that state; it is consent to marriage in its essence and totality. Marriage cannot possibly be narrowed down to carnal union, nor does carnal union of itself set up an indissoluble tie. This would reduce holy matrimony to a state which could be defined in terms of biology and psychology alone. It would leave out of account the intention of free persons to enter by solemn contract into the state of marriage as it has always been understood. By every standard, pagan or Christian (for marriage, as our Lord declares, was not newly instituted by Him but was "from the beginning"), a man who marries a woman with whom he has already had intercourse intends to enter upon a new and honourable relationship. Even to the pagan who may not look upon marriage as indissoluble, marriage is different from "concubitus."

M. R. Newbolt.

LAUDA SION

Sion, sing with exultation;
Sing thy captain of salvation;
Praise thy Shepherd joyfully.
Dare to let thy voice go ringing,
Tho' His worth surpass thy singing,
Feeble tho' thine anthem be.

Great thy theme and great thy glory
Telling once again the story
Of the twelve in brotherhood;
How in very truth was given
By our God Himself from Heaven
Living and lifegiving food.

Lift thy voice in ample measure,
Loveliest strain and sweetest pleasure,
Echoing out to West and East;
This is one day the Church doth celebrate
Mindful how her Saviour did consecrate
At the first this holy feast.

At this table now a second
King and second law are reckoned
And a second Paschal rite;
Here the old gives place to new,
Shadows flee before the true,
Darkness vanishes in light.

As He took the loaf and brake it,
Blessed the cup and bade them take it
Ever in His memory,
Sacred precepts thus we follow,
Bread and wine we here do hallow
For a sacrifice to be.

Christian folk thus hold unshaken
In the bread His flesh is taken,
And the wine becomes His blood;
Past all sight and understanding,
Living faith its right demanding
Makes the knowledge sure and good.

Different each outward token,
For His flesh the bread is broken,
For His blood is poured the wine;
Yet we hold the wealth of Heaven,
In His fullness Christ is given
In and through each several sign.

Each and all can here enjoy Him,
Yet not rend Him nor destroy Him
With their eating, nor divide;
Wholly He for all sufficeth,
This and that alike ariseth
From His table satisfied.

Good and evil at His table
Both to take their Lord are able,
Yet the issue differeth,
Each alike his judgment making,
Due reward of his partaking,
This of life and that of death.

See, the bread is broken duly,
Firmly then believe and truly
That the whole is present fully,
Parted tho' the fragments be;
What the outward symbol hideth
Undiminished still abideth,
For one priestly hand divideth
Nothing save what thou canst see.

Ancient sign and type foreshowing,
Isaac to the hilltop going,
Blood upon the lintel flowing,
Manna in the wilderness;
Children here their bread are gaining,
Guarded safe from dogs' profaning,
Angels' food for man's sustaining
As toward the goal they press.

O good Shepherd, ever leading
By still waters, hear our pleading;
Living Bread, Thy children feeding;
Jesu, in Thy mercy heeding,
Guard us, bring us of Thy grace
Where we may through Thine own merit
Bliss with all Thy saints inherit,
Heaven's own banquet, nor defer it,
Thine the power to confer it,
Where the living see Thy Face.

St. Thomas Aquinas
(*Translated*, S. P. T. Prideaux).

ŒCUMENICA

Sir,

As the editor of *Œcumenica*, the Anglican theological quarterly published by S.P.C.K. in the French language, which has now been in circulation four years, and is welcomed and read with eager interest by Catholic, Orthodox and Protestant readers on the Continent, I write to ask for the support of Anglican friends in increasing its effective circulation. There are many on the Continent who would like to read *Œcumenica* but cannot obtain it—partly owing to poverty, and still more owing to governmental restrictions on the transmission of money. The English price is 4s. per annum; my proposal is that subscriptions should be sent to S.P.C.K. (Northumberland Avenue, W.C. 2) for copies to be sent to some address abroad—we have plenty of addresses at the office—or that readers in England should subscribe for a copy and apply to the office for an address abroad to which a copy could be forwarded by themselves. This latter plan would have the additional advantage of establishing a personal contact between someone in England and someone on the Continent at a time when contacts are becoming more and more valuable.

H. A. Moreton.

The Close, Hereford.

NOTES ON PERIODICALS

Les Questions Liturgiques et Paroissiales. October, 1937.

Dom B. Capelle, in a study of the Dies Iræ as a "lyric of hope," outlines its composite origin, a recently discovered Neapolitan MS. taking back the main part to the end of the twelfth century. Its place in the Office of the Dead, and the concluding stanzas which alone refer to the departed, appear first in Franciscan service books, and may be due to Thomas of Celano, traditionally described as the author of the hymn.

The Abbé Nogues resumes his studies in the origins of Advent, illustrating from early Sacramentaries his thesis that it began by commemorating the mystery of the redemptive Coming of Christ as a whole (hence the significance of its references to the Old Testament and St. John Baptist). This later became distorted by the increased emphasis laid on Christmas as the historical commemoration of the Nativity.

The issue closes with notes on several recent books on the saints, and a comprehensive bulletin and review of literature on the liturgical chant.

H. DE C.

REVIEWS

THE DESTINY OF MAN. By Nicolas Berdyaev. The Centenary Press. 16s.

Professor Berdyaev has obtained a great reputation in England as well as abroad, and deservedly so, for there are few more perspicacious interpreters of the trend of civilization. It may be doubted, though, whether this, one of the largest of his works to appear in English to date, will enhance that reputation. For its author is only at his best when he has his feet planted on terra firma; when he leaves this world and indulges in theosophical flights he becomes little better than a purveyor of what is at best obscure and at worst nonsense. Unfortunately the present treatment of ethics spends very little time on the ground. Berdyaev is convinced that ethics is not a science but an art which draws its principles, if principles they can be called, from speculations about the nature of God and the spiritual world which can only be described as bizarre.

The book accordingly begins and ends with the supernatural world. In Part I., which is entitled *Principles*, our author, after a brief philosophical introduction, discusses the nature of God and man. Part II., under the description of *Morality on this Side of Good and Evil*, deals with three moral systems, the Ethics of Law, Redemption and Creativeness respectively, and concludes with a section upon some concrete moral problems (which appear, as Berdyaev treats them, not to be so very concrete after all). Part III. returns to theosophy in a discussion of eschatology. The author's general thesis is that only the third system of ethics he describes, the ethics of creativeness, is a satisfactory one in the light of Christianity as he understands it.

The central idea of this ethical scheme is that of the uniqueness of every moral act. In our author's view every situation with which human beings are faced has a character of its own and cannot be solved upon general principles. The golden rule is that there is no golden rule; to that extent he would agree with Bernard Shaw. Our task is to react to each dilemma as it presents itself in such a way as to create something new. "Creativeness is always a growth, an addition, the making of something new that had not existed in the world before." We thus co-operate with the creative work of God by every moral choice.

In so far as it is a protest against formalism and a rebuke

to those who fail to see the complexity of the factors which make up every moral situation, this conception of morality is valuable, but it is pushed by Berdyaev to unjustifiable lengths. After all, the number of possible ethical dilemmas, though admittedly large, is not strictly infinite, and general rules must have some application to individual cases. Moreover, to make every man his own casuist is to produce not a higher morality but moral chaos. There is a place for law in human moral life, and we suggest that Berdyaev's failure to appreciate the value of law is due to the general modern tendency to regard it in a juridical and Austinian way as being no more than command. The Middle Ages with their firm grasp of the principle that law, if it is to be valid at all, must find its basis in reason have much to teach us all here.

It is not, in fact, difficult to discern the sources of Berdyaev's impatience with moral norms. They spring partly from a general mistrust of logic which is both a symptom of the general "flight from reason" of our age and, in our author's particular case, a characteristic of the Slavonic tradition. Partly, too, the attitude arises from the characteristic Russian sympathy with the sinner and mistrust of the "unco' guid." This in essence is but a reflection of the Gospels and worthy of all praise. But it is one thing to realize that human judgments are fallible and that it is not those who appear to us—or to themselves—to be "good" who are really so, and quite another to suggest, as Berdyaev constantly does, that our standards of good and evil are at fault. There is a definite confusion of thought here which goes far to vitiate the whole argument of a book which takes as its motto Gogol's statement that "It is sad not to see any good in goodness." It is not merely sad, we would suggest, but also mad.

The error is fundamental, however. It takes its rise from the position adopted in the first section of *The Destiny of Man*, where the author takes the statement of Genesis that man's fall was the result of his eating of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil very literally indeed, and suggests that to distinguish between the two principles is a falling away from a higher state of knowledge. Though the idea leads him into difficulties and contradictions—as when he is compelled to assert that "it is bad that the distinction between good and evil has arisen, but it is good to make the distinction, once it has arisen" (p. 49)—he holds to it consistently and gives to his last chapter the title "Paradise: Beyond Good and Evil." It may be that the full meaning of Berdyaev's thought has escaped us—it is certainly difficult to gather it from his book—but the general first impression left upon one's mind is that of

an Oriental pantheism in which good and evil are both aspects of Deity. Such an impression is unjust, however, for from other parts of the work it becomes apparent that Berdyaev is much more of a dualist. He thinks that evil arises from a pre-existing element in man, to which he gives the name of "meonic freedom." He seems to conceive of this as something akin to a self-existent, recalcitrant and evil matter which is used in the process of creation. It is, as the very name of it implies and as he repeatedly asserts, nothingness, not-being, and yet he obviously regards it as something positive, for it is the source of rebellion against God. How nothing can be something we fail to understand. Berdyaev's whole position seems to us a self-contradiction which, while it pays lip-service to the Platonic idea of evil as non-existence, is in reality thinly disguised Gnostic or Manichæan dualism. At all events he fails to make clear that his idea is essentially different from this ancient heresy.

We do not wish to suggest that this portentous volume is a farrago of nonsense. That would be no less untrue than impertinent. It is very well worth reading, and it abounds in acute observation and aphorisms of real value from which space forbids us to quote. Though it can fall, as in the sections on sexual morality and on hell, to something perilously near journalistic rant, it can rise also to great heights. But we do feel that its fundamental bases are both confused and untrue and that it will be a thousand pities if this outlook comes to be regarded in England as the received ethical doctrine of the Orthodox Church. Professor Berdyaev is really representative of no one but himself. His thought is far from being without interest and cannot be dismissed with contempt. Moreover, it contains much Christianity. But we think he has misunderstood the philosophical bases of Christianity as profoundly as did his Gnostic predecessors. Fortunately, though, Christianity is more than a philosophy, and it is possible to be at heart and by desire a Christian in spite of philosophical aberrations. This, we feel sure, Professor Berdyaev is.

THOMAS M. PARKER.

NOTICES

THE ORDINAL AND CUSTOMARY OF THE ABBEY OF SAINT MARY, YORK (ST. JOHN'S COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE, MS. D.27). Edited by the Abbess of Stanbrook and J. B. L. Tolhurst, F.S.A., F.R.Hist.S. Volume I. Pp. viii+176. London. 1936. Subscription one guinea per annum.

The seventy-third volume of the publications of the Henry Bradshaw Society belongs to a class of literature which does not receive nearly so much attention as it deserves. To the expert it seems hardly worthy of attention unless for any reason it exhibits abnormality, and then a page or two of illustrative extract serves his purpose. For the inexpert the difficulty of the subject, which is really not so serious as he deems, proves a deterrent from venturing upon it at all. That unfortunately means that such knowledge as he may acquire will depend largely upon illustrative extracts, and what he will fail to gain is just the sense of routine, even of an "identitas" which might be a source of accidie, which will make him understand what mediæval religious life of this kind was like. And it is not uninteresting to learn, as he may from this volume, in what form a collect ought to be ended, in which way, in the ceremonial for particular combinations of circumstances, to pass from a section beginning "In missis vero privatis" to one which opens "Domnus autem Abbas quotiens ad altare magnum celebrabit in pontificalibus erit" with all things agreeably, to find the "Cautelæ missæ" followed by a section "de Prandio" or to learn the exemptions which belong to doctors of theology or of canon law, the privileges of the "boy abbot" or what the novices did at lessons in the cloister. The present volume is only an instalment, but it will produce on anyone who reads it carefully a quite definite impression, however well he may in theory know all that it contains or ought to contain. He may wonder if the learned editors are always quite impeccable in matters of proof-reading, for the volume contains some things which it is hard to believe that any mediæval scribe ever wrote who was at all likely to write out a book of this kind; but these are passing flecks only, and he will look forward to see if this or that which is referred to as coming is really dealt with and become quite eager for the next volume or two volumes. Only, why does not someone who is living the modern counterpart of this life take a description of a day or two, explaining every term of routine or furniture not with the fulness of a dictionary, but sufficiently to substitute an English equivalent in most cases for a Latin term, so that the students who are being trained in what are called mediæval studies shall be a little less ignorant of elementary things and thus be able to find their way about. It would be unreasonable to expect the Henry Bradshaw Society to provide a glossary, though even in so technical a work as Brightman's *Liturgies* it was not disdained.

CLAUDE JENKINS.

THE PAULINE EPISTLES, AND THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS, IN THEIR HISTORICAL SETTING. By F. J. Badcock, D.D. S.P.C.K. 8s. 6d.

One of the most instructive parts of Dr. Badcock's book is his careful, patient and exhaustive analysis of the 197 expressions regarded in Grim-Thayer's Lexicon as peculiar to the Pastoral Epistles. By a process of critical research through an extensive literature this list is first reduced to 185, then by comparison with the Septuagint to 101, then by reference to Aristotle to 57, then by a study of non-Christian authors contemporary with the Apostolic age to 47, then by New Testament comparisons to 32. Thus "Dr. Harrison's contention that on the grounds of vocabulary these epistles belong to the second century would seem to have broken down under examination." Dr. Badcock himself holds that these epistles "belong to the time anterior to the first Epistle of Clement, and are at least substantially Pauline," the conclusion being that the peculiarities of the Pastoral Epistles are due neither to St. Paul nor to his secretaries, but to an editor working over Pauline matter, a process which most probably took place at Rome.

The discussion on the second Epistle to Timothy and on Ephesians has a speculative air about it, whose value would require an expert student of this particular problem to estimate. One thing, however, that will strike the average reader is the perpetual recurrence of the word "probable." It is repeated twelve times over in less than ten pages, varied with the phrases "it is not impossible" or is "very probable," or "more likely." Whether probabliity is or is not the guide of life, there is an impressive sense of insecurity about this critical use of it. It is a question of degree. But of course the construction so erected is highly speculative.

The Epistle to the Hebrews is the subject of a chapter by itself. Dr. Badcock's reminder that this Epistle is "the New Testament classic on the doctrine of the Atonement" is by no means superfluous, considering the scanty use of it by some recent writers on that momentous theme. The Epistle is represented as substantially the work of Barnabas, but with a Pauline postcript, and to have been known to St. Clement of Rome, who, by the way, is described by Dr. Badcock as "a kind of foreign secretary to the governing board, probably one of the bishops, but not necessarily so."

Dr. Badcock's work is a scholarly achievement, obviously the product of long continued study and reflection. W. J. SPARROW SIMPSON.

HISTORY OF CHRISTIAN WORSHIP. By Oscar Hardman. London Theological Library, University of London Press. 5s.

This is a history of Christian Worship, apparently designed as an introductory textbook, from the beginning to the present day, in a space of 240 pages. Naturally it cannot be more than a summary; naturally also much must be omitted, and statements must be condensed, and so assume what may appear to be an over-dogmatic form. The first two chapters are devoted to the first seven centuries, and the remaining six to the more modern period. This is not an arbitrary division. Roughly speaking, from A.D. 700 onwards there is a relative

abundance of texts in full form, though, of course, more in the second millennium than for the earlier three hundred years. Of this second period we have nothing but praise for Professor Hardman's treatment. There are no doubt items omitted on which one student or another would desire information, but, when space is limited, an author must be allowed to exercise his discretion in this regard.

During the earlier period, on the other hand, the textual matter is far more fragmentary and allusive, and conclusions must often be based on inferences which are far from certain, and we think that sometimes the reader should have been warned that the ground under his feet was very insecure. F. J. Badcock.

The Reformation in England. By L. E. Elliott-Binns, D.D. Duckworth. 5s.

The author may be congratulated on a very useful book. He has a wonderful knack of presenting facts lucidly and never losing his way in a maze of events. Nowhere can one find out exactly what happened so easily as in this book. He has some happy phrases. He calls, for instance, the Presbyterian organization that was springing up in the reign of Elizabeth a shadow church, and says that the Puritans looked on the Church of England as a case of arrested development. But he is not entirely successful in overcoming the tendency to dulness, which is the almost inevitable result of crowding so many facts in so small a space.

He seems to underrate the blow to education inflicted by the Chantries Act of Edward VI. Mr. A. F. Leach in *English Schools at the Reformation* has shewn what a shattering blow this was, as nearly all the chantry priests had to keep a school. In Herefordshire alone thirteen grammar schools were destroyed. It was the Chantries Act far more than the Dissolution of the Monasteries which was responsible for the decline of students at the Universities.

In his chapter on "The Principles of the English Reformation" Dr. Elliott-Binns is, perhaps, least convincing. He summarizes them under three heads: Nationality, Continuity, and Uniformity. Under Nationality comes the subordination of Church to State; under Continuity is discussed the authority of Scripture and the place of tradition. The classification may be justified if we look at the Ecclesia Anglicana with the eyes of Elizabeth or Cecil, but if we take a wider sweep and survey the whole Anglican communion today we see that there were underlying principles, which have only gradually emerged. The subordination of the Church to the State is today a peculiarity of the Church of England. Would it not be nearer the truth to say that whereas in the last resort the Roman Catholic made the voice of the living Church uttered by the Pope his final court of appeal, the Presbyterian and the Lutheran the word of Scripture, and the Anabaptist and the Quaker the inner light in man's heart, the Anglican Fathers were faithful to all three, while vindicating the rights of reason denied by the Puritans? The result, if less tidy, is in the long run more satisfying.

We must thank Dr. Elliott-Binns for a very fair and a very useful book. He tries hard to be impartial and on the whole succeeds very

well. He is, perhaps, too much inclined to quote Professor G. M. Trevelyan as though a quotation from that eminent author settled the matter, and he is hardly fair to Mary Queen of Scots. To anyone who wishes to learn in a short compass just what happened at the Reformation in England we can warmly commend this book. C. P. S. CLARKE.

STUDIES AND DOCUMENTS. Edited by K. Lake and S. Lake. VII. *The Pseudo-Philonic "De Jona," Part I.* By Hans Lewy. IX. *Ritual and Cults of pre-Roman Iguvium.* By Irene Rosenzweig. London: Christophers. 7s. 6d. and 15s. respectively.

If this series, which has already included editions of the *Excerpta ex Theodoto*, St. Epiphanius' *De Gemmis*, and the Greek fragment of the *Diatessaron* from Dura, continues to maintain its high standard, it will merit a place in the annals of theological scholarship alongside the *Texte und Untersuchungen*. Of the two contributions under review, the first contains an edition of the Armenian text of the *De Jona*, falsely attributed to Philo. Though no MS. of the original Greek is known, Dr. Lewy is able to give us particulars of twelve MSS. of the Armenian version. Of these he finds six of use for establishing the text. The editor argues that the school which made the translation is the same as produced the Armenian version of St. Irenæus, and he believes that this school was founded in Byzantium soon after A.D. 570. A second part, which will contain an English rendering of the text and an account of the relation of the *De Jona* to Hellenistic Judaism, is announced for early publication.

Iguvium, which occurs in the title of the other fasciculus, conceals the modern town of Gubbio in Umbria. The work will be of concern primarily to those whose interests are in the early history of Roman religion. In an appendix the Umbrian text of the Iguvine Tablets, together with a Latin rendering, is reprinted from Buck's *Oscan and Umbrian Grammar*, and it is upon this material that the study is based.

F. L. CROSS.

CHRIST'S HEALING MIRACLES. By T. W. Crafer, D.D. S.P.C.K. 2s. 6d.

A study of the thirteen miracles of healing recorded by St. Mark, case-papers, as it were. The writer is a member of the Guild of St. Raphael and is concerned to help forward the cause of the revival of spiritual healing. Much useful and detailed information is given with regard to the study and diagnosis of a case, the approach to the patient, the co-operation with the medical profession. The writer avails himself of recent new knowledge about the relation between the mind and the body and the growing experience of the relation between the spirit and the body. He shews the value of intercessory co-operation on the part of Christians with the healer, even though they may have little knowledge of the technique of healing. After each case suggestions for intercession for similar cases are appended. H. LOVELL CLARKE.

DEATH OR DOGMA. By E. L. Mascall. S.P.C.K. 3s. 6d.

"Religion can be either a consolation for the discomforts of a perverted world or an instrument for its regeneration." "The first need of a Christian Sociology is a careful study of Christian dogma." The writer is deliberately provocative from the title onwards, holding Christians to be of the company of those who have turned the world upside down, challenged its valuations and reversed them. His weapons include pointed humour. He repudiates a sentimental sociology, a watered-down version, sociology without tears. He is critical of a vague religion of uplift without sure doctrinal foundation. Instead of an intermittent church defence he would have a perpetual church aggressiveness based upon a vital faith in the Christian creed. He knows his modern world.

H. LOVELL CLARKE.

THE HOLY GHOST. By Edward Leen, C.S.Sp. Sheed and Ward. 7s. 6d.

The popularization of theology is an increasing need, and Fr. Edward Leen is perhaps one of the best known of writers of popular doctrinal manuals. His latest work is a full study of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit written in such a way that it may be understood by the reader who is not a professional theologian. It is an important study, though, as might be expected, bearing all the marks of the strictest orthodoxy and concluding with a defence of the position adopted towards our Lady by the Roman Catholic Church. Modern philosophies of Revelation would seem to have passed Fr. Leen by, and he shews no appreciation of the work done in these fields by modern Protestant theologians, such as Dr. E. F. Scott, Dr. Garvie, or the Barthians. His onslaught upon Marxism is extremely ungenerous, and he would have done well to have remembered that the Marxist doctrine of materialism is dialectical and not mechanistic. By overlooking this elementary fact, he fails to provide any answer to those who seek some point of contact between Marxism and Christianity, such as Professor MacMurray or Dr. John Lewis. His book is not without its uses, but the reader would do well to recall that the whole subject of the Holy Spirit and of the work of God in the world of today has been one of the vast theological interests of recent years, and that this has brought to it a freshness of approach which Fr. Leen fails to illustrate.

F. H. AMPHLETT MICKLEWRIGHT.

AFRICA AND CHRISTIANITY. By D. Westermann. Oxford University Press. 5s.

The Duff Lecturer for 1936 has adopted a refreshingly new manner in missionary literature. His study of problems of the African mission field is linked up with the problems of the sociologist and of the anthropologist. There can be no doubt that, in the past, all too much missionary work has failed to take notice of the whole of the context in which it finds itself. The result has been that it has become the appendage of methods of colonization which, from a Christian point of view, have sometimes been of the most dubious character. The approach made by Dr. Westermann considerably minimizes this danger. African life

is seen as a whole. It is a heritage containing ideals and traditions. The coming of Christianity is something projected into the midst of this cultural heritage. It finds itself in competition with Islam and with more primitive forms of religion. It can only gain a true place in African life by adopting a scientific attitude towards the whole of that life. Again, there are sociological problems, such as the notorious colour bar. It is the task of the missionary to act as intermediary between Black and White. Dr. Westermann makes an appeal that an African Christianity should be thought out in terms of the African heritage and not be merely Western. He also appeals for a localized Christian literature. This is an important book, and we commend it as a worthy introduction to the host of problems that it raises. F. H. Amphlett Micklewright.

Christianity, Communism and the Ideal Society. By James Feibleman. Allen and Unwin. 12s. 6d.

"My aim is to influence the politics of the future though not of the immediate future," says the author of this ambitious book. His method is that of diagnosis. *Nominalism* is "responsible for all the peculiar troubles and difficulties" of today; for pragmatism, behaviourism, Freudianism, individualism, agnosticism, democracy, dialectical materialism, liberalism, free trade. Is Mr. Feibleman a fascist? No, he attacks fascism. A Christian? Certainly not. Christianity "has committed the realistic fallacy of crypto-materialism." Catholicism condemns the world. "The full approval of the Church can be bestowed only upon those who take Holy Orders and who so deny the world, the flesh, and the devil." "Marriage is evil, but may be blessed by the Church. It is the truce declared between the devil and God, the happy mean between burning and the taking of holy orders." Protestantism is nominalistic. "It has chosen to pretend that Protestants do not sin." Curiously enough, this is not a bad book. It is vigorously written and full of good things. But the Christian reader must be pardoned for not taking it seriously. W. K. Lowther Clarke.

RELIGION AND THE PLAIN MAN

Back to God. By W. Thompson Elliott. Nisbet. 2s. 6d.

You Can Find God. By Edward Shillito. Rich and Cowan. 3s. 6d.

Evangelism: Its Principles and Implications. S.P.C.K. 2s. 6d.

All these books are addressed to Christians of average intelligence; and with the exception of the last, which is pastoral in its appeal, should be of special value to the laity. In *Back to God* Canon Thompson Elliott provides a context for the Archbishop of Canterbury's *Recall to Religion*; and his healthy optimism should act as a good antidote against the grey, rather than black, outlook with which the Church of England is faced. For the Vicar of Leeds is not blind to the fact that it is largely our own fault that we are just where we are; and even goes so far as to admit that "our failures and unrest lie too deep to be any purely human care." Religion may therefore be said to probe depths to which our psycho-

analysis cannot reach unaided; and some constructive religious policy of life shows itself to be necessary. The Archbishop himself opens the book with an approving foreword.

Mr. Shillito's book is concerned with the relationship between God and the individual man; but his claim to avoid the mystical outlook is not quite justified, because it is the consciousness of this union of the individual with the Divine that is the goal of mystical experience. The author shews himself to be familiar with various types of religious experience, and at home in the work of such different thinkers as Mr. Walter de la Mare, the late Baron von Hügel, Mr. T. S. Eliot and the Danish Catholic, Jörgensen. Moreover, his mind is refreshingly clear about the problems of those who must hold very different religious views from his own; and his own convictions never obtrude themselves.

It cannot be denied, however, that the book achieves its unity of idea after a certain amount of straining; and one is tempted to wonder how much of it was written at about the same time or with the same purpose in view. If it be true, as the blurb claims, that " the author, in simple language, describes some of the paths which the seeker must tread in his search for God," then the appeal of the book should have been more individual than it actually is. Its psychology is individual, but the story of man's search for God is hardly told as a personal experience. It is impossible to avoid the feeling that Mr. Shillito has here attempted something in the nature of a simplification of that type of book at which the Baron von Hügel and Miss Evelyn Underhill are known to excel. There are works which cannot be simplified, as the student of mysticism must know; but, on the practical side, the author has done a real service in harmonizing what he has perhaps failed to unify.

Finally, there comes what can only be described as an anthology of pastoral instruction—foreworded by the Bishop of Leicester. In it the Bishop says, " Each parish has its own story and its own special character, but experience gained in one parish can often do much to stimulate and guide another." One hopes that there is enough brotherly feeling among parishes to make such an event usual! Certainly this little book should do something to foster that brotherhood as well as the more intimate relationship between the priest and the layman. *Evangelism* should be of great use to the new incumbent anywhere in England; and, like the other two books upon this list, takes nothing more for granted in the reader than his wish to do the work of God and get to know Him better.

ASHLEY SAMPSON.

Printed in Great Britain by Billing and Sons Ltd., Guildford and Esher